THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

JULY 1966

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

BRIAN SIMON — BRITAIN TODAY AND TOMORROW

NAN GREEN — AFTER FRANCO—WHAT NEXT?

IDRIS COX — WORLD HUNGER AND ECONOMIC "AID"

DISCUSSION:

RAYMOND SOUTHALL — LAWS OF DIALECTICS

JOHN LEWIS, ADAM FOX — THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND MARXISM

NIGEL KELSEY — FOLK MUSIC AND FREEDOM OF ART

G. FREEMAN — TRADITIONAL FOLK SONG

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 10 No. 7

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	193
Brian SIMON	Britain Today and Tomorrow	198
Nan GREEN	After Franco—What Next? ...	204
Idris COX	World Hunger and Economic "Aid"	209
DISCUSSION:		
Raymond SOUTHALL	Laws of Dialectics	216
John LEWIS / Adam FOX	The Dialogue Between Christianity and Marxism ...	219
Nigel KELSEY	Folk Music and Freedom of Art	222
G. FREEMAN	Traditional Folk Song	223

AMONG ARTICLES IN AUGUST AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Dennis GOODWIN	In Defence of Trade Unions
John BERGER	Mannerism
R. M. De MORGAN	Modern Computer Programming
Jessie KOCMANOVA	The Socialist Poems of William Morris
J.-P. VIGIER	Rationality and Modern Sciences
Ernst WANGERMANN	Rosa Luxemburg
Bob WILLIAMSON	The Genetic Code

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Margaret Manley,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 14s. 6d.
Twelve issues 29s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

THE Common Market is in the news once again and it appears that Mr. Wilson, if given the opportunity, will try to get in on pretty much the same terms as Heath tried to do in 1962-63.

In this connection it is worth remembering Wilson's own obituary on the Common Market negotiations of 1962-63. In the House of Commons on February 11th, 1963, he attacked the Conservative contention that the Government were within an ace of a satisfactory solution when de Gaulle vetoed Britain's entry.

> "Let the myth be nailed once and for all. Even ignoring the long list of unsolved problems—from the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement to New Zealand butter, the association of Commonwealth African countries, the price level for food and agricultural prices, transitional provisions for British agriculture; quite apart from all these unsolved issues, the fact is that the terms which have been already negotiated, the accumulated totality of vital national and Commonwealth interests surrendered by this Government already constituted a national humiliation. . . . There have been unacceptable concessions on agriculture, on net tariffs, and a total collapse of what should have been our position on voting rights and on the extent of the veto. We therefore reject this account of a satisfactory agreement sabotaged by General de Gaulle."

Yet there is every indication that the Labour Party, if given the chance, would be prepared to go into the Market, on the same terms as Heath was prepared to do in 1963.

"*Going will be Rough*"

The Economist, which is in favour of Britain joining the Market, nevertheless notes that if Britain goes in it may have to go through a veritable time of troubles.

> "The point of this appraisal of the possible benefits for British industry is not to pour cold water on British entry into Europe. On the contrary, the long-term effects would be highly beneficial. But now that most of British industry is so bullish about joining, it is worth while recalling how tough the first years could be. . . .
>
> "For Britain in the long run it opens the way to more vigorous economic growth: in the short run with our balance of payment weakness and exposed position as proprietors of a reserve currency, the going will be rough."

So the immediate effect of going into the Market will be certainly adverse. The long-term effect is at the best speculative.

Some Kind of Dole

The argument that the long-run effects of entering the Market would be good are based on the assumption that entry into the Market would force the British capitalists to become more competitive. Mr. Sidney Wells, who is Reader in Economics at the University of Sussex (who endorses this view) can nevertheless see quite a number of snags:

> "It is often said that the integration of the United Kingdom economy in some wider grouping could make of Britain a second Ruhr; but it could also turn these islands into an enlarged Northern Ireland—an area where unemployment has been consistently higher than in the rest of the British Isles.
>
> "There is of course no finally consistent evidence one way or the other but the persistence of a relatively slow growth rate in Belgium in spite of rapid growth in the rest of the community and indeed, the wide regional differences in growth rates and income levels which continue to exist in the United Kingdom, sheds some doubt on the efficiency 'overspill' argument.
>
> "If the United Kingdom joined an Atlantic grouping with the present exchange rate, I have suggested that an initial deterioration in the balance of trade is to be expected. If this deterioration makes necessary the imposition of tougher financial policies then all the evidence from recent years suggests that the rate of growth of the economy would be slowed down.
>
> "Of course, it may be that some kind of 'dole' will be available to enable the United Kingdom to weather the first effects of the removal of her tariff, or alternatively, the entry of Britain into an Atlantic or European Economic Community might be regarded as justifying a devaluation of the pound." (*Trade Policies for Britain*, by Sidney Wells. Oxford University Press.)

There is the basis for some Common Market slogans here, as for example—"Britain must enter the Common Market and get on to some kind of 'dole' " or "The Common Market calls on you to cut the purchasing power of the pound".

A Fishy Business

At the very moment Tories are favouring Britain entering the Common Market in order to force British industry to face up to invigorating competition, they are also denouncing the decision of the Government and the Monopolies Commission to prevent a gigantic merger on the fishing industry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ross Group made a takeover bid to the shareholders of Associated Fisheries Ltd. which would have resulted in a £50 million merger that would have owned 117 out of the 196 trawlers in the "distant waters fleet" and would have controlled over one half of the Humber landings of cod, which in turn constitute more than 70 per cent of the total supply of cod in Britain. The Monopolies Commission found that the merger would neither increase the efficiency nor reduce prices and recommended that the Government forbid the merger which the Board of Trade agreed to do.

Immediately there was an uproar. *The Daily Telegraph* reported that "Monopolies decision shocks city" and *The Financial Times* said that it hoped that this decision would not be a precedent. *The Financial Times* quoted a minority of the Commission to the effect that the merger would only control one-fifth of the total fish landed. This may seem all right to *The Financial Times* but most people will be surprised that monopolisation in this industry has grown to such threatening proportions. Of course attitudes to the monopolies have grown a bit softer. In the last years of the Conservative period the Government was stressing "competition"—abolition of resale price maintenance and all that. Now the Labour Government has been stressing the small size of some British productive units and therefore the need for "good" mergers, to bring larger productive units into existence. That is why the "City" thought that the Government would regard the Ross venture as a "good" merger. It should not despair. The turning down of the Ross venture could be the Board of Trade's last stand against the monopolies.

PIB in a Knot

The Prices and Incomes Board has re-affirmed its repugnance to wage awards to any group of workers being justified by a comparison with the wages paid to a similar group of workers in a similar occupation elsewhere.

In the Government statement on "General Conditions affecting Prices and Incomes" it was stressed that comparisons of wages and salaries with those prevailing in other industries "should carry less weight than hitherto".

So when the Government called in the Prices and Incomes Board to make "an overall comparison" between the salaries of English and Scottish teachers the PIB reproved the Government for asking them to make overall comparisons at all. Finally, after some eyewash about the difference between the Scots and English educational systems, the PIB comes to the conclusion that the recommended increase of 15 per cent for the Scots be scaled down to an increase of 13 per cent which is the same as the English award.

So it condemns comparisons, only to end up by making a comparison.

In fact its job is really to find excuses for holding down wage and salary increases. It has a sheath of shifty arguments, which it applies according to the circumstances, even if those arguments stressed in one PIB report, contradict those stressed in another. There is not and cannot be any honest guiding principles in incomes policy as more and more unions tricked by the PIB are coming to realise.

Meantime neither the PIB nor the Government have told the teachers if comparisons with other professional workers are not to be given the same weight as hitherto what is to be given weight.

Industrial Workers of the World

Two years ago the publication of *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology*, by Joyce L. Kornbluh gave today's younger generation an opportunity to get a picture of the Industrial Workers of the World as a "singing movement". The publication now of the fourth volume of Dr. Philip S. Foner's monumental work on the *History of the Labour Movement in the United States* makes available a detailed and comprehensive history of this brilliant meteor on the American labour scene.

Like the previous volumes, this work is based on exhaustive research, including material that was not available to Paul R. Brissenden, in his pioneer study of the IWW in 1919. This 608 page book, that deals with the origin, birth, principles, composition, activities and errors of the IWW, is written in a scholarly yet interesting style and has exhaustive reference notes.

While predominantly syndicalist in its outlook, the IWW had its origin in American conditions. Its arrival on the scene in 1905, together with its history-making Preamble that stated:

> "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among the millions of working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.
>
> "Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political, as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labour through an economic organisation of the working class, without affiliation with any political party."

brought together the best known revolutionary leaders of that day—Haywood, Moyer, Trantman, St. John, Frank Bohm, A. M. Simons and not least of all Eugene V. Debs and Daniel De Leon. A dramatic moment of the first convention was when Debs said to De Leon that despite sharp differences

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was ready "to take by the hand every man totally regardless of past affiliations" and De Leon announced that he and Debs "had shaken hands over the bloody chasm of the past".

The organising of the IWW answered the needs of four distinct forces: the need for a trade union for the millions of unskilled and migrant workers who were ignored by the AFL; the recognition among growing numbers that to combat the strength of monopoly capitalism in its mass production industries industrial unionism was necessary; the groping for an illusory short cut to a Socialist future by means of a revolutionary mass movement unencumbered by Socialist theory, discipline or politics and propelled by a combination of enthusiasm, direct action and a General Strike; an organised expression of sectarian perfectionism projected by De Leon and the SLP, whereby the industrial union would be the parallel wing of the political party which would automatically evolve into the new Socialist Industrial Commonwealth, without worrying about State power—either capitalist or socialist.

There is described in detail how the IWW evolved through various stages, with the "direct actionists" securing control, resulting in various splits including the departure of both De Leon and Debs as well as its main constituent—the Western Federation of Miners. Despite this, its colourful and dramatic activities, especially in the West, and in industrial towns heavily populated by foreign born workers, have left its indelible mark in American labour history.

Although never able to consolidate organisationally its far-flung activities, constantly harassed by police, hindered by its own advocacy of sabotage, the IWW did blaze a trail for organising the millions of unskilled and semi-skilled, for industrial structure of trade union organisation, and for solidarity and unity of all workers—calling boldly for the organising of the foreign born, Negro, Japanese and Chinese workers.

There are interesting chapters describing the unsuccessful efforts of Wm. Z. Foster and Tom Mann, to convince the IWW to also direct its efforts to working within the recognised trade union movement—the AFL.

For all practical purposes the IWW came to an end with World War I. Some of its well-known leaders found their way into the Communist Parties of the USA and Britain, like Wm. Z. Foster, "Big Bill" Haywood, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Jack Johnstone, George Hardy and Charles Ashleigh.

This book is a "must" for all serious students of the American labour movement.

The Thirties as they Lived

After so many recent inaccurate and cynical accounts of the Spanish Civil War—now rivalling Henry James as the favourite subject for Ph.D. theses—comes *Journey to the Frontier*[1]; an intelligent and sensitive double biography of Julian Bell and John Cornford, young English volunteers who died in that war. The wide critical interest it has attracted shows how keenly the history of the thirties is now being re-examined, both by those who lived through the events and those (like the American authors of this book) who have to reconstruct them from papers and interviews. What they are looking for is not only the past which is already a legend; in some way they are looking for the future.

The two whose lives are recorded here have become a symbol for the thousands of British volunteers who fought and died in Spain in the first battles against Fascism. History has singled them out partly because, as poets and writers, they were able to leave a vivid and enduring record of what they thought and felt. But if they were outstanding in their gifts, they were also representative: and the interest of this book lies in the rich human picture it gives of the young Socialists and Communists of that generation.

Since the authors present their story as far as possible from original sources, with a minimum of general comment, reviewers have reinterpreted the facts according to their own attitudes.

Thus Nigel Dennis in the *Sunday Telegraph* could see only "contrived bravado", "shameless self-deceptions of the Left", and ended by suggesting that the Franco regime which resulted from the war was at any rate better than a Communist one. Raymond Mortimer in the *Sunday Times* wrote of Cornford's "losing his independence of mind completely" and proclaiming "degraded opinions". But this tone was the exception. Far more reviewers respected the honesty and courage of both men as something to be humanly proud of.

Professor Quentin Bell, brother of Julian Bell, in a review in the *New Statesman* perceptively recalled the atmosphere in which Communist-Left-Labour unity made such strides in the thirties.

> "We lived beneath the ever-lengthening shadow of Fascism, Fascism triumphant abroad and welcomed by a number of solid, moneyed sympathisers at home. Before its onslaught we reeled in wavering confusion until suddenly, like Brave Oliver, a fearless and highly disciplined reinforcement appeared on our left flank. We felt then that intense, uncritical and not unreasonable gratitude which was for a time, in the 1940's, to be shared by the entire nation. We had to wait through many years of

[1] *Journey to the Frontier*, by Peter Stansky and William Abrahams. Constable, 50s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sorrow, questioning and disillusion for Stalingrad, but already in the thirties there were young men and women, intelligent, enthusiastic and dedicated who made a final victory seem possible. They restored our morale."

Whatever conflicts, uncertainties and political differences with the Communists the Left-wingers had, these reviews bear eloquent testimony to the impact of a Communist like John Cornford on his generation (and indeed, through his writings, on later ones). He was, says Quentin Bell, "the perfect type of the admirable Communist—highly intelligent, completely loyal and unselfish, yet neither priggish, sentimental nor puritanical". "An astonishingly intelligent, mature, integrated and uncompromising youth", says John Davenport (*Spectator*), who knew him slightly. "He found Marxism the answer to his problems, and his beliefs drew him inevitably to that grave in Spain. He combined a cool intellect with a passionate nature, and was a mature man at the age of twenty-one." And Ian Hamilton, in *The Listener*, rightly rejected the "neatly oedipal" psychological explanation of Cornford's political dedication and energy.

> "The ease with which he surrendered the personal life, the guts with which he taught himself to manage the appalling battlefront conditions of the Spanish war, are more those of a man unquestioningly dedicated to a solving triumph than of one who flees the thing he dreads, and has been raised on."

"*Go On, Shrug*"

Michael Foot, MP, in the *Evening Standard*, movingly summed up the political importance of the book. He was convinced of the outstanding qualities of both men—Julian Bell with his "admirable self-knowledge" and clear vision of what England must do in the three years before facing War: John Cornford, "braver still, if the quality can be measured. He loved life even more, had even more to give. If he had lived he would have become a great poet or, more probably, a leading political figure in the land."

Yet Foot is in no doubt about the value of their cause:

> "Spain was the single most elemental force which ever hit the English Left in this century. It was not quite powerful enough to upset the sedate manners and minuets of the Labour Party, but it almost did even that. . . . [Cornford] and 2,762 other British volunteers (most of them, by the way, not poets: 80 per cent of them working class) saw England's freedom swaying in the Spanish scales. Were they just a bunch of eccentrics, tricked by an international conspiracy or deluded by their own Leftish hallucinations?
>
> "The modern craving for cynicism is fed by the official histories. But . . . dig a little deeper into the archives and it will be discovered that Hitler and Mussolini were ready to retreat if the British and French Governments had shown one hundredth part of the courage of the Bells and the Cornfords. Fascism *could* have been destroyed on Spanish battlefields. That truth, proclaimed by the Bells and Cornfords when the statesmen were blind and craven, still stands."

What does this mean for us today? Denis Potter, too young (like Jimmy Porter) to have taken part in the struggles of the thirties, concluded in a passionate review addressed to the cool, clinical readers of *New Society*:

> "The authors do not go in for overt diagnosis, but their detachment trembles on the edge of something even more valuable when they are writing about Cornford. The neutral tone sparks into a tiny glow of commitment. The 'far-off decade' starts sending out reverberations. . . .
>
> "I finished the book in time to see a television newsreel of American bombers swooping over Vietnam. Go on, shrug."

No-one can prove now what Cornford or Bell would have been saying and doing five or ten or twenty-nine years later even if their friends feel pretty sure that it would not have been what Denis Healey or Harold Wilson were doing. The nature of the past is that it is over. The only tribute to the dead that is worth anything is to re-establish now on a more lasting basis that unity in action of the Left to which this book stands as a testimony.

Police Spies and Labour History

German historians have done much in recent years to fill out the history of the Communist League from its formation in 1847 to the 1848/9 Revolution and the years that followed. But after the revolution, after it had split up, and after it had been officially dissolved at the end of 1852, its influence continued.

At the beginning of 1852, on the initiative of Marx and some of his close associates among German émigré workers, a New Workers Club (Neue Arbeiter-Verein) was formed in London. That it was formed was known from Marx's correspondence, but nothing was known about its activities until the discovery of a series of reports sent in by a police agent to a German police official Greiff, attached to the German Legation in London and forwarded by him to the Prussian police. This valuable document now lies in the Brandenburg Archives in Potsdam.

It was Marx who inspired the formation of the Club, and it was former members of the Communist League who had been won to Marx's outlook who formed the kernel of its membership. Among the members whose names might be known to British readers were Johann Georg

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eccarius, the tailor, a co-founder of the Communist League, Wilhelm Liebknecht, a close friend of Marx and his family, and later on Wilhelm Wolff, another of Marx's close associates.

The Club had about 60-70 members on its foundation (at the Bull's Head Tavern, New Oxford Street) on January 18, 1866, and had doubled its membership by July. Its purpose was essentially educational—to spread the revolutionary ideas that Marx and Engels had put forward. The normal form of its meetings was a discussion around some formulated problems like "Can a revolution be carried out by propaganda alone?" or "What is the influence of the Church on the revolution?" or "Is the dividing up of the big landed properties in the interest of the proletariat?" or "Is it in the interests of the revolution that the workers, in present conditions, should participate in struggles for reforms?" or "Is the political transformation of society determined by the transformation of production relations or *vice-versa*?"

In the discussions, petty bourgeois ideas were often put forward and there were still traces of the old conceptions of political putsch or revolution by conspiratorial uprising. Marxist ideas were consistently defended by Liebknecht and the older Eccarius.

Extensive extracts from the police agent's report have been published by the GDR *Journal for the Study of History*, along with an interesting background article by Gerhard Becker.[2]

Of course one has to be cautious in accepting these reports. Police-inspired fantasies and forged reports of so-called secret revolutionary meetings abounded already in the 1840s. But the meetings of the New Workers Club were open; reports could be checked, and these would appear to be accurate.

Which goes to show that even police spies can have their utility and to make us look forward to the day when MI5 and its affiliates are obliged to disgorge their massive material on the history of the British Labour movement.

The Historical Association and Labour History

It is good that the Historical Association has, in recent years, shown an increasing interest in the history of the radical and Labour movement.[3] Last year saw the publication of a pamphlet on "Radicalism and its Results, 1760-1837" in the Aids for Teachers Series, and a thought-provoking booklet on "Chartism" by F. C. Mather of Southampton University, who, some years ago, wrote a book on "Public Order in the Age of the Chartists".

Mather's work stresses the importance of research on Chartism in the different towns and areas of Britain, and emphasises, perhaps over-emphasises, the geographical diversity of the movement.

Some local Branches of the Historical Association have sponsored work on the Chartist movement in their particular areas and this has resulted in two well-documented pamphlets—"Coventry in the Age of the Chartists" and "The Chartists in Bristol".

It is hard for those of us who know our contemporary Coventry to realise that in the 1830's it had only some 30,000 inhabitants, a great part of whom depended for their living on the manufacture of silk ribbons and watches. But even before the 1832 Reform Act it had, proportionally, one of the largest electorates in Britain (some 3,000 electors increasing to nigh on 4,000 after 1832). And it was renowned for the turbulence of its elections. In the 1833 election there were 1,000 special constables enrolled on the basis of one for every four voters. Very early a centre of radicalism (William Cobbett polled 517 votes there in 1820), Coventry was an important if not a particularly militant centre of Chartism. As Peter Searby, author of the study of Coventry Chartism concludes, "the Coventry weavers and watchmakers lacked the economic spur to militant Chartism of other kinds of domestic workers like the destitute nail-makers of the Black Country, the stocking-frame knitters of Leicester and the hand-loom weavers of Manchester."

Bristol, which had been an important centre of radicalism, was in the view of John Cannon, author of "The Chartists in Bristol", an early but not particularly powerful centre of Chartism. Henry Vincent coming there in December 1839 as a "missionary" of the London Working Men's Association, declared that he was determined to "rouse the people of Bristol from the sleep in which they had too long lain". But, in Mr. Cannon's view, support for Chartism was never as strong in Bristol as in the much smaller neighbouring city of Bath. One angry correspondent to the Chartist *Northern Star* in mid-1843 described Bristol as "decidedly the most prejudiced, bigoted and priest-ridden city of the Empire".

Be that as it may, all this work of local history is fascinating and rewarding, and we would always be glad to know from our readers of work of this sort that is being carried out in their localities.

[2] *Zeitschrift fur Geschichtswissenschaft*, No.1, 1966

[3] See R. J. White—"*Radicalism and its Results*, 1760-1837" (2s.); F. C. Mather—"*Chartism*" (3s. 6d.); Peter Searby—"*Coventry Politics in the Age of the Chartists* (3s. 6d.); John Cannon—"*The Chartists in Bristol*" (2s. 6d.).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain Today and Tomorrow

Brian Simon

Economic, Moral and Political Crisis[1]

IF we look only at surface phenomena it might be arguable that nothing that can be described as a "crisis" situation exists—that an admittedly slow rate of economic growth is bringing an increasing affluence or well-being spreading to wider and wider sections of society; that the country is politically stable, and that our moral stance enables us to get by. There are many who would accept just such an analysis.

But of course it is precisely the strength of Marxism that it enables us to look beneath the surface, to penetrate beneath the play of the contingent and the unforeseen that appears to constitute history, to the real forces bringing about change and development. The great strength and tremendous appeal of Marxism lies in the fact that here—for the first time—was advanced a theory of social change which owed nothing either to supernatural forces or to such idealist abstractions as "the general progress of the human mind" as agents of change. Hence Lenin's description of Marx—as "the first to elevate sociology to the level of a science"—remains as relevant today as when it was first stated 70 years ago. Marxism enables man to understand himself as man—in his historical development, so bringing social evolution into the sphere of scientific investigation and ultimately holding out the prospect of its conscious human control. Further, Marxism unites theory and practice—analysis and action. Over the last 50 years the significance of Marx's famous thesis on Feuerbach has become increasingly apparent: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in different ways; the point, however, is to change it".

I want to stress as an increasingly significant factor the growing recognition of the power and relevance of Marxist ideas, sometimes among circles far from the Communist Party. Refutations of Marxism, such as Bohm-Bawerk's *Karl Marx and the Close of his System*, which appeared in the 1890s, have abounded, and of course we should expect a consistent history of refutations to so challenging and dynamic a theory—this, after all, is what the ideological struggle is about. "Marxism is dead", declared Professor Stuart Hampshire two years ago, just at a time when the revival of interest in Marxism was making itself felt in the universities and elsewhere. Alongside the refutations goes the construction of alternative "models" of the functioning of society—in economics, politics and sociology. Among these one might cite Pareto's theory of élites, which sought to provide an explanation of the nature of power in contemporary society, and which, developed specifically as an anti-Marxist thesis, has provided what might be called an alibi for Marxism in social analysis—a means of evading the crucial issue of the nature of classes and of the class struggle as determinants of social change.

It is, therefore, a matter of considerable interest that a leading sociologist, Professor Bottomore, should in a recent book *Elites and Society* (1964) not only give a clear exposition of the origin of élitist theory as a counter-Marxist "model", but also subject both the earlier theories of Pareto (and his follower, Mosca), and the more recent development of such theories by, for instance, T. S. Eliot and, among sociologists, Wright Mills, to a criticism which sets out to re-establish the Marxist concept of class as the most fruitful of hypotheses in the interpretation of power in contemporary society; and, finally, to show why Marx's conception of socialism, in its political, economic and moral aspects, is the model of a classless society which does not require, and indeed is inimical to, the formation of élites, since in the classless society envisaged by Marx, individuals stand in a direct relation to each other in conditions of equality. It may be that élite theory can be used with some degree of plausibility to explain the nature of existing socialist societies and stress their similarity with the capitalist societies of the West. But this is an area of discussion and analysis which I do not propose to enter here. I want only to point to the significance of Bottomore's analysis as one which, taking its point of departure, as it were, from anti-Marxist sociological theory, sets out to re-establish the relevance of the Marxist approach. There is little here to show that Marxism is dead.

I would like to refer to another recent book, Geoffrey Barraclough's *Introduction to Contemporary History*, also published in 1964. Barraclough is unusual as a historian both because he is prepared to tackle *contemporary* history, and because of his ability to abstract himself from national and ideological considerations and to grasp the nature of social change in its widest manifestations, both geographically (his analysis is not Europe-centred),

[1] This is a shortened version of the lecture given by Brian Simon at the first session of the Week of Marxist Discussion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at a variety of levels, from politics and economics to art and culture. His book concludes with a discussion of the nature and significance of Marxism under the heading "The Ideological Challenge—the impact of communist theory and Soviet example".

A New Historical Phase

It is Barraclough's thesis that the world entered a new historical phase around 1957-60. One of the factors now appearing, following the 20th Congress of the CPSU, he describes as "the rise of China, the emergence of 'national communism' and the acceptance of the possibility of 'separate roads to communism'." Marxism and Leninism, he writes, now "ceased to have even the appearance of specifically Russian doctrines", and this, he adds, was in accordance with Lenin's own conviction, since Lenin "had always emphasised the universal character of Marxism". For 30 or 40 years Marxism was "closely identified with the Soviet Union" (and this for perfectly valid reasons from a Marxist point of view); but these historical circumstances no longer obtain. "Soviet Communism," he writes—and I am giving you his point of view—"is, of course, still a powerful force in the world; but the impact of Marxism in its different forms is broader, more varied, and less monolithic than in the days of Stalin". Referring specifically to its relevance and attractive power for "the emergent peoples", he points out that Marxism has "the dynamism, the comprehensiveness, and the emotional appeal which their situation demanded". "If we are to measure its impact", he concludes, "we must see it not simply as a Soviet Russian ideology, but as Lenin saw it, as a universal force with a universal mission. It has already shaped twentieth century society on lines different from anything known in the past; and its force is not yet spent."

Of course we might take issue with Barraclough on a number of points in his analysis, perhaps particularly with his description of Marxism as an "ideology". Nevertheless his analysis is worth noting, perhaps particularly his stress on the significance of the Twentieth Congress as inaugurating a new phase of creative Marxism. It is worth noting that the two books I've referred to are popular books appearing in the New Thinker's Library whose general editor is Raymond Williams. Both of them stress, in their different ways and from different standpoints, the power and relevance of Marxism—yet neither are by members of the Communist Party. This is what I mean when I say that the relevance of Marxism to the solution of contemporary problems—and overall to the condition of man generally—is today being widely recognised.

"The New Thinker's Library", writes Raymond Williams, in his general introduction to the series, "has no ties to any particular doctrine, but it assumes that our many problems need the widest possible discussion, if they are to be wisely met. To inform, to stimulate, to follow the argument wherever it leads: these are its commitments". Such is the sense—the feeling of the time, and this leads us to the question of the dialogue—of discussion—and of the ideological struggle generally, its nature and forms. There is, of course, a difference between a discussion between people, both Marxists and non-Marxists, who are approaching a similar standpoint and seeking to find a common platform, and the ideological struggle between those with opposing standpoints, for instance between socialists on the one hand and the ideologists of imperialism, racialism, and monopoly on the other. But between the two there is a whole spectrum of levels of discussion or struggle—struggle can merge into discussion or dialogue and *vice versa*, as dialectics should tell us. The nature, tone or style of discussion is therefore important—that is, if we wish to convince people and win them to our standpoint, rather than simply to reinforce our own convictions and stress our separation from all other interpretations that may be offered.

Dogmatism

Dogmatism, the repetition of old and stale formulas—these have always been recognised as harmful to Marxism, by no-one more insistently than Lenin himself; yet we have scarcely avoided this charge in the past. Here we do not have to go the whole way with Adam Schaff to grasp, and to agree with, his essential point. Those of you who have read his *A Philosophy of Man* will know what I am getting at. Schaff was concerned at the situation, a decade or more ago, where the youth of Poland was turning from Marxism to Existentialism in the search for the answer to fundamental questions concerning the condition of man. He sharply attacks what he calls "nihilistic criticism" which consists in the reiteration of dogmas and the shallow and superficial rebuttal of opposing, or at least different, ideological standpoints.

He goes on to enumerate three conditions for "effective criticism". Although the situation in Poland is no doubt different from what it is here, I think them worth repeating, as being relevant to our own position, where, a small minority, we wish to make the widest possible impact:

(i) Criticism of opposing views "must be based on proper knowledge and citation of the opponent's view, which must be opposed with pertinent counter-arguments".

(ii) "It must single out in the views criticised the problems which account for their attraction, and which remain even when it is agreed that the solutions offered for them are false."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(iii) "It must put forward alternative, positive solutions, of those problems. Criticism is effective when it not only shakes the confidence of those it addresses in the correctness of their views, but also demonstrates the superiority of the counter-solutions it proposes. If this is not done, we lose the fight from the outset. We only strengthen the resistance of those who regard the given problems as important, and often create an emotional block—the worst enemy of common sense and rational discussion."

In what sense, then, can we speak of a crisis, economic, political and moral? Primarily in this sense—that mankind is now living through what is certainly the most critical period in its history. The period is that of the transition to socialism on a world scale; at the same time weapons of destruction exist of such immense power that a third world war would mean the extermination of entire peoples. With one third of the world already Socialist, with the accelerating development of the national liberation movement, with the sharpening contradictions between the capitalist and the socialist world, and between the capitalist countries themselves, there exists an overall crisis facing humanity as a whole. The chief problem facing the people is to find the way to Socialism while at the same time fighting by every means for peaceful coexistence.

It is within this overall situation that we must examine the problems of this country. In what sense can we speak of an economic crisis here?

Economic Crisis

The Marxist position is clear. The basic contradiction under capitalism is the contradiction between the increasingly social nature of production and private appropriation.

As Marx predicted 100 years ago, the concentration of capital and monopolisation of the means of production has proceeded at an accelerating rate. Hence production itself is increasingly socialised in the sense that the units of production are getting larger and larger, employing not only thousands but tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of workers, technicians, white collar staff and managers. Yet the effective ownership of industry, outside the state sector, is concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. From this contradiction arises the basic features of capitalism as we know them.

In the inter-war period these expressed themselves in the form of mass exploitation and recurrent economic crisis, in extreme poverty covering whole sections of society which had its basis in massive unemployment rising to two and even three million and amounting to over 50 per cent of the occupied population in some areas. The 1920s and 30s were marked also by periodic wars—resorted to as a means of solving the crisis of capitalism by different countries—by deep social contrasts in living conditions and by sharp political and class tensions.

There could be no doubt, then, of the existence of economic crisis in the 1930s, but what is the position now?

In the first place we should note a further growth in monopoly which has sharpened the basic contradiction already referred to. We must note also a deepening of the level of exploitation of the working class in the post-war period—in spite of everything that has been done, there has been no effective transfer of the product of industry to the working class. On the other hand the very high level of working-class organisation and action that has been achieved during and after the war has succeeded in bringing about conditions of relatively full employment. Post-war capitalism in Britain has also been marked by a consistent (if relatively small) measure of economic growth, though the economy has been subject to equally consistent inflationary crises leading to the stop-go policies used by every government, Labour or Conservative, since the war.

But we cannot draw a sharp contrast between the two periods. Exploitation still continues, as it did in the past. The problems of poverty are very far from having been overcome; only last month Abel-Smith and Peter Townsend showed that in our so-called "affluent society" poverty is widespread and actually increasing, with millions "substantially below the average earnings" including two million children. In his pamphlet *The Irresponsible Society* Professor Titmuss concluded that, over the last two decades, there is little or no evidence "that society is any nearer to the solution of these problems of dependent poverty, inequality and unfreedom". It is the old people who are particularly vulnerable, and of course the proportion of the old is increasing; but it is also that considerable section of the working class which has not got effectively organised unions to fight for and protect its interests, especially those with large families.

Finally, in spite of the advances in some spheres since the 30s there has been no solution to fundamental social problems, such as housing.

There has, then, been no basic change in the nature of capitalism—its inner contradictions are as evident now as they were then. Indeed in important respects they have sharpened. The last two decades have seen tremendous advances in science and technology—automation, new forms of energy, new types of control systems; if these could be fully applied the possibilities for social advance are enormous. Monopoly capitalism is daily showing itself incapable of utilising to the full these new techniques; the slow rate of economic growth in Britain stands in sharp contrast not only to developments in the Socialist countries but to what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be achieved here if socialist social relations replaced capitalist.

Nor is it only a question of the contrast between the rate of growth in this country and the possibilities that actually exist for economic development—not only in Britain, but, as Bernal showed in detail in *World Without War*, throughout the world. For the term "economic crisis" does not only apply to our own country; poverty and hunger exist today on an enormous scale throughout the world, particularly in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In these countries it is becoming increasingly recognised that, following the example of Russia and China, socialism provides a clear and immediate alternative to the capitalist economic system. Hence the attractive power of Marxism to the people of these countries. Indeed the ability of Marxism to find a solution to this problem also enhances its attractive power to workers, intellectuals and others in the West who, in the long run, have nothing to gain from capitalism and who are beginning to see that their interests are one with the ex-colonial peoples in the establishment of socialism as a world system; recognising that this must be the ultimate solution to the problems of poverty in what has become a world economy.

It may be that Marxists, in their economic analysis of capitalism, have tended to attach too much weight to features of capitalism that expressed themselves very sharply in the 1930s, but which, since the war, have been less in evidence—such, at least, was the conclusion of the conference of Marxist economists last summer held at the Gramsci Institute in Rome under the auspices of *World Marxist Review*. Certainly capitalism has shown new features in the post-war period, and certainly it must be the task of Marxist economists to make a realistic analysis of such features as increasing monopolisation; in particular the increased part played by the State in economic affairs (especially through armaments), the internationalisation of the market, and what Maurice Dobb has called the increased sensitivity of the capitalist class itself in an era marked by the increased strength of the working class and the overall transition to Socialism.

But no-one knows what the future will bring, economic dislocation and unemployment or economic advance, nor, if the latter, at what rate. What we do know is that the overall economic crisis, in the terms I described, certainly does exist, while the gap between what is and what might be grows wider. Recognising the existence of this crisis it must be our urgent function to overcome it; for though we analyse these things in economic terms, it is human beings who suffer from the crisis in its different forms—through deprivation, starvation, the denial of the conditions giving them the right to be men. What is the situation, then, when we turn to examine our moral behaviour, our relations one with the other, relations which are themselves formed by the nature of society itself?

Moral Crisis

Some people may be surprised that Marxists should devote attention to moral issues, but their surprise is misplaced. Particularly in his early writings, Marx devoted a great deal of attention to moral questions, and this strand of his thinking can be traced throughout his work—up to Volume 3 of *Capital* where Marx looked ahead to the realm of human freedom which it is the purpose of Communism to bring about.

Here again I think it relevant to present Marx's view through the eyes of Professor Bottomore, a student of Marx's early writings—those who wish to check the correctness of his exposition can go to the works he cites themselves. "Marx's sketch of the classless society", he writes, "incorporates moral, sociological and historical elements", and he points out that "the moral aspect is treated most fully in some of his early manuscripts, particularly in the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*", adding later: "few modern advocates of equality would dissent from Marx's moral ideal of the classless society".

I cannot here give an exposition of Marx's whole concept of the classless society—nor enter into any detail in what is involved in terms of the full development of the individual and of the nature of his relations with other men and with society as a whole. The outlines of this view are, however, well summarised by Bottomore as follows:

> "From this aspect a classless society is defined as one in which men will exercise a much greater, more equal, control over their individual destinies; would be liberated from the tyranny of their own creations such as the state and bureaucracy, capital and technology; would be productive rather than acquisitive, would find pleasure and support in their social co-operation with other men rather than antagonism and bitterness in their competition with them."

What Marx was concerned with was to develop the conditions for "the free development and activity of individuals under their own control"—where each could "contribute as fully as possible in deciding issues of general social importance".

Marx reached these conclusions as a result of his analysis of the condition of man in existing society. The division of labour—especially that between mental and manual labour—was the obverse of the coming into being of private property. From this arose the alienation of man, his estrangement one from the other, his exploitation—and, with the development of technology, the constricting of each

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual into a specific mould according to the nature of his occupation—the worker in particular being turned into "a mere appendage of the machine". In this situation man's "slumbering powers", as Marx put it, cannot be developed—they are warped, distorted, according to conditions which no man has chosen for himself. The enormous development of production under capitalism, however, provides the conditions for man for the first time to make his own history. For capitalism brings into being a working class (or factory proletariat) whose historic mission it is to bring about the revolutionary transformation of society to socialism, so providing the conditions for bringing class rule to an end, and for developing new social institutions capable of making the transition from socialism to communism.

Such, then, very briefly put, is the standpoint of communists, concerning in particular the nature of man—his potentialities—and the relations between man and man. To realise their moral ideal in practice, Marxists are necessarily forced to take part in political activity in its broadest and deepest sense; although it is the conditions of life itself, of classes and the class struggle, which motivate men directly for this struggle. And if we speak of a moral crisis today we refer to the contradiction between such an ideal, which in its broad outlines is shared by hundreds and thousands of people, if often in a shadowy way, outside the ranks of the Marxists, and the conditions that actually exist in the relations between man and man.

Wherein lies the strength of the anti-apartheid movement, which has such an appeal among the young, if not in the disgust that people feel that one set of human beings should treat another as if they were inferior—another species? "We'll walk hand in hand" expresses in the simplest and most direct form feelings and ideas of human solidarity that animate not only the freedom riders in the United States but millions of people throughout the world. In Rhodesia the moral issue stands sharp and clear for all to understand as the Christian churches have realised, while in Vietnam with the full support of Harold Wilson and Michael Stewart, American bombs seek to crush and exterminate a people struggling to be free. It is no accident, I suggest, that the Communist Party is the only political party whose stance on every one of these issues is clear and straightforward, nor that it is the only party which has a morally defensible standpoint on the whole question of immigration to this country. For Marxism teaches us that moral and political questions cannot be separated.

One might take this analysis a great deal further. Galbraith, in his book *The Affluent Society*, highlighted the specific feature of capitalist society in the striking phrase "private opulence and public squalor"; I have already referred to Titmuss's conclusions and to those of Abel Smith and Townsend which bear directly on the problems of equality and poverty. You may say that these are basically political questions, but they also pose moral issues. Indeed they pose most sharply the question as to which form of society is most likely to give the conditions for freedom and individual development —that based on private property, or that based on socialism. Our present form of economic and social organisation is one which, in practice, necessarily puts *things* before people, money before human and social values. While the mainspring of capitalist society is acquisition, the property one man accumulates is accumulated, either directly or indirectly, at the expense of the majority and their prospect of a full life. Perhaps I could conclude by quoting what I have already written on this subject in *The Challenge of Marxism:*

> "This situation cannot be changed by offering men absolute values to aspire to, which remain pure only because they are so far from any general realisation on the social plane. It can only be changed by bringing men into action to remove the actual conditions which further moral corruption, self-seeking and cultural debasement. There is no other way of promoting a new social morality and new cultural values than by challenging the very foundations of the acquisitive society and sweeping it away. This, in itself, would be a moral act, a realisation of new values in practice, and so a promise of further positive human development—for this can only come about in the course of social action, action directed to using all the resources of society for truly human ends."

As, one might add, was outlined by Marx when he pointed out that the working class, to assert themselves as individuals, must overthrow the state. For only with the revolutionary transformation of society, as he wrote: "does self-activity coincide with material life, which corresponds to the development of individuals into complete individuals and the casting off of all natural limitations".

I have concentrated so far on the economic and moral crisis in our society. What, then, is the nature of the political crisis?

Political Crisis

The political crisis of our time arises from the fact that attempts are being made to solve pressing social and economic problems within the confines of monopoly capitalism and neo-colonialism. As a result the policies arrived at are basically reactionary and opportunist, as indeed they must necessarily be under the circumstances. Seldom has this been more dramatically high-lighted than at the December session of the United Nations, where the rep-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resentatives of an entire continent walked out when the British Prime Minister presented his case. The government's policy over Rhodesia is simply one example of the consistent failure to come to terms with the modern world; caught up, as it is, with American imperialism in a final effort to maintain our imperialist role. The crisis of Britain in the world is, then, specifically the political crisis of our time.

Among the people attempts are being made to break with the old structures. The surge towards the Liberal Party, which expresses itself now and again, is one example of this. The left in the Labour Party is another; as the Labour government is drawn more and more into reactionary policies—on Vietnam, on immigration, on a host of other issues —so there is developing a crisis within the ranks of the Labour Party itself. But we should remember that this is the fourth Labour government this country has experienced, and that this one, no more than any of the others, offers no fundamental solution to our problems.

The political crisis, then, as well as the economic and moral crisis, can only be overcome by breaking the rigid structures of monopoly capitalism and neo-colonialism through the introduction of socialism. This, in the long run—and the quicker we can do it the better—must be the way forward for the British people.

The introduction of socialism will not, of course, automatically solve economic and social problems that are the result of decades and centuries of development. It was Marx himself who pointed out that socialism emerges, as it were, from the womb of capitalism, and that socialist society is bound for some time to bear the birthmarks of its origin. Further, socialism itself brings new problems, new contradictions, which are specific to this new form of social organisation.

While we must, therefore, take a realistic view, it remains true that socialism is the precondition for the solution of the moral, the economic and the political crisis. By releasing the potential energies of the people who now begin to control their own future; by recognising and giving scope to their immense capacity for development; and by making possible the rational distribution of resources in terms of economic and social planning, it holds out the prospect not only of a greatly increased level of production, but also of a richer, fuller, more varied and more interesting life for the mass of the people. The development of automation—the technology of the future—brings with it no menace of unemployment and rejection as in the United States; on the contrary, by reducing the hours of necessary labour, it increases the realm of what Marx described as "human freedom"—the true aim of Communism.

The ideals of socialism, in their broadest sense, are deeply embedded in the British people, especially, of course, among the working class. Indeed Britain can be described as the home of socialism, as Marx recognised, for was it not Robert Owen who first put forward the concept of the co-operative community involving the exclusion of all private ownership? As we know, Owen's ideas seized hold of the most advanced elements among the nascent working class nearly 150 years ago, and many efforts were made at that time to contract out of the competitive set-up under capitalism, where each man's hand was against the other's, and establish instead co-operative organisations of various kinds. This was at the stage of the political baptism of the British working class.

William Morris's analysis of the nature of class society, of the relations between men under capitalism and in particular of the stunting of human potential through the division of labour was very close to Marx's own analysis in his early works. Morris's vision of socialist society, where men stand in a direct human relationship one to another, and where individual potentialities could be realised, also laid hold of the minds of the most advanced members of the working-class movement 80 years ago. Of his ideas Edward Carpenter wrote that the Sheffield socialists, whom he knew, "though common working men and women, understood well enough the broad outlines of this ideal. They hailed William Morris and his work with the most sincere appreciation." It was Morris who expressed his views on the morality of capitalism most sharply. "For I do declare, he wrote, "that any other state of society but Communism is grievous and disgraceful to all belonging to it".

We should not forget that it was the Social Democratic Federation, whose outlook was based on Marxism, that first brought the ideas of scientific socialism to the workers of this country. Its formation predated the ILP by nearly 10 years, and the Labour Party by 15.

Since the formation of the SDF in 1884, a political party based on Marxism has consistently existed in this country. The Communist Party is, therefore, the heir to a long and great tradition.

Those of us who accept the analysis made by Marx and developed by Lenin of the nature of capitalist society, and of the laws governing social change, have, of course, a specific approach to the winning of socialism. There is no need to outline this here as I think it is well enough known. Fundamentally Marxists see capitalism as a stage in social evolution, one subject to certain laws of motion including that of the increasing concentration of capital and consequent monopolisation of the means of production. They recognise fundamental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divisions of interest within capitalist society itself and hence the inevitability of struggle between sections of society having opposing interests, especially the working class on the one hand, and those owning the means of production on the other. With the development of monopoly a situation arises where not only are the means of production themselves highly socialised, but where ownership and control is concentrated in fewer and fewer hands.

This situation constitutes both a threat and an opportunity. It constitutes a threat because, in the words of *World Marxist Review* in its introduction to the symposium I discussed earlier (November, 1965), continued monopoly concentration "is the objective soil for reactionary policies aimed at whittling down or abolishing democratic freedoms —policies designed to halt the advance of the working class and to force down its standard of living".

It constitutes an opportunity because, to quote the same source: "the changes now taking place in the capitalist economy, such as the continuing concentration of production and centralisation of capital, the emergence of new forms of monopoly, the growing role of the state, the internationalisation of economic life, and the trend towards integration —demonstrate the necessity of the transition to socialism".

After Franco—What Next?

Nan Green

SPAIN is in ferment. Despite the blanketing censorship that prevents the full facts from reaching the outside world, despite the self-imposed silence of much of the European press, it is becoming more and more apparent that something important is going on, that *change* is in sight and is indeed taking place.

The strike movement in Asturias, the Basque Country and other industrial areas; the emergence of strong, united "workers' commissions" in Barcelona, Madrid, Bilbao, Seville, Asturias and elsewhere, challenging the fascist-type trade union system; the anti-Franco demonstrations that have been taking place even in the centre of Madrid; the growing clamour of the peasants for their age-old demand—the land to the tiller; the movement among the students, their free assemblies and mass demonstrations for the right to form their own associations; the repeated pronouncements and declarations by groups of professors and intellectuals, voicing the democratic aspirations of the whole people; the gulf which is becoming apparent between the reactionary Church hierarchy and the newer Catholic forces, lay and religious, urgently demanding change—all these are aspects of a present-day struggle which is shaping the Spain of tomorrow.

The Spanish people's struggle against the Franco dictatorship, in fact, has reached such a level that the problem of the future becomes an urgent necessity to be faced. *After Franco—what next?* This question is being asked not only by the people of Spain and their rulers (all too well aware that it is on the agenda). It is being asked abroad, and in all political circles too. It should concern us. For the answer involves our future, the future of Europe and world peace. And it involves our unfulfilled responsibility towards the Spanish people whose struggle against Fascism, begun thirty years ago this month, might have prevented the second world war if it had received greater and more united support from the labour movement of this and other countries.

In a recently-published book[1] Santiago Carrillo, General Secretary of the Spanish Communist Party, sets forth his party's reply to the question. Based on a close and careful analysis of the actual situation inside Spain (and we need no reminder, except perhaps the single example of Julian Grimau, to show the heroic risks undertaken by the members of the central committee of the Spanish Communist Party to maintain contact with that situation) the book gets straight down to the present, its problems and possibilities; this is not an abstract theme but a down-to-earth Marxist programme of action which offers solutions based on Marxist thought and concrete experience.

Who won the war of 1936-39? asks Santiago Carrillo, plunging immediately into the first requirement of the Spanish people, the foremost demand of the Communist Party for years past—*reconciliation*. The war cost Spain a million lives and enormous material damage. It is said that the Republicans lost and the so-called "Nationalists" won. But it was the people—on either side—who lost, and those who won were the handful of big financiers and landholders who were determined to

[1] *Despues de Franco, que?* Editions Sociales, Paris.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preserve their privileges, together with a few thousand high officials who had feathered their nests by the misuse of public funds. Those who had fought on the Republican side were persecuted, imprisoned, put to death or exiled. But what became of the vast majority of those who fought for Franco? Did they win anything? How many of them in these subsequent years have had to leave the land their forefathers had held for generations? How many have not faced ruin, been forced to go abroad to find work? How many have not seen their children obliged to go the same way? (There are something like a million "economic refugees" from Spain in other parts of Europe today.)

Franco and his clique have kept themselves in power precisely by fostering this worn-out division among the Spanish people, by playing on the old hatreds and hostilities, by pursuing and persecuting all former opponents, the Communists above all as the most dangerous of them. But the Spanish people have had enough of bitterness and revenge. The older generation want no more civil war, they are sick of fraternal strife, of Spaniard against Spaniard. The young people never experienced the reason for it; they do not see why the events of thirty years ago should determine, in 1966, whether they *as a whole* should be able to learn, and do, what they need to know and to do in order to live in the world of the 1960s.

And thus reconciliation is the first necessity for progress. "Today's main essential", says Santiago Carrillo, "is to bring together all the patriotic and popular forces regardless of what side they fought on in 1936-39, or what side their parents were on, to bring Spain into line with the modern world". And this means that Spain must get rid of the rule of the reactionary fascist regime of the monopoly-capitalist and landlord oligarchy which profited from the war. So there must be an end to all discrimination between "conquerors" and "conquered", there must first of all be an amnesty for all political prisoners and exiles, *amnesty on both sides*. "What Spain needs today is democracy, dialogue. But it must be a genuine dialogue in which all voices are heard, in which all who have something to say can take part. A dialogue without preconditions or censorship."

The Developing Struggle

Recent years have witnessed an amazing growth of unity and struggle among the Spanish people, amazing because almost inconceivable in the existing conditions of Spain where strikes, demonstrations and all forms of free association are illegal. This has been accompanied by a new interlinking of action between workers, students and intellectuals. In the course of these actions, says Carrillo, thousands of people have been drawn from passivity into political struggle.

Let us examine some of the democratic achievements that have been won in this period. Carrillo lists five main ones:

First, the strike movement of 1962 and subsequent years has *smashed* the wage freeze and the percentage increases laid down in Franco's Development Plan. (British workers up against the Prices and Incomes policy please note.) Measured in millions of hours lost and numbers involved in strikes, the figures show that in the last three years Fascist Spain has been one of the capitalist countries where working class struggle has shown the biggest development. Generally speaking the Spanish workers have succeeded not only in halting the fall in wages which was envisaged in the "stabilisation" plan but in winning increases, some of them relatively substantial. Even the agricultural workers have taken an active part in this movement and have won increases.

These victories have had a big effect on the economic policy of the Franco regime, and consequently on its stability. This can be measured by the words of the Secretary General of the Falange, who earlier declared that the regime depends on two main factors: "The life . . . of Franco, and the success of the Development Plan."

Second achievement is the creation of new forms of trade union organisation. Franco's "Vertical Syndicates" have proved themselves incapable of change, incapable of becoming representative. The reforms they could not carry out have been achieved by the "Workers' Commissions"—a new form of factory and trade union organisation which is replacing all the former bodies, legal or illegal, based on political or religious organisations. These commissions are not yet legal, but nevertheless have won *de facto* recognition. Managements and authorities are having to hold discussions with them; they will, it is envisaged, extend throughout the whole working class before long, and will spread to the peasants' organisations as they have already done among the students.

Thirdly, strikes—though still illegal—continue and increase while victimisation becomes less. Franco's Minister of Labour, meeting considerable pressure in the ILO from representatives of several socialist and capitalist countries, felt obliged to assure them that the regime was going to legalise economic strikes. This has, of course, not happened; so far there has only been a watering down of one article in the Legal Code which makes any strike an act of rebellion against the state. This cannot yet be called a big victory but it shows a most important trend, influencing also the right to free assembly and demonstration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fourth achievement of the recent period has been the virtual disintegration of the Fascist-controlled student union (SEU). The students are still battling for their right to form free student unions, but the government is fully aware that the SEU cannot control them any longer.

Fifth is the replacement of the Military Tribunals by Courts of Public Order to try political cases, and the achievement of the 72-hour limit for arrest without charge. Though brutal sentences are still passed by the Courts, though the vindictive spirit of the civil war still prevails in political cases, nevertheless, in the opinion of the Spanish Communists, it cannot be said that the repression is comparable to the fascist terror that once prevailed.

These are not the only achievements of the Spanish people in the recent period, but they are singled out by Santiago Carrillo because they illustrate the beginning of a change which is affecting the political structure of the Franco regime.

The change is proceeding slowly, a step at a time, and every step resisted by the dominant group in Franco's government which is mortally afraid to lose the instruments that have enabled it to maintain its domination for the last 25 years. This group, the fascist generals and bureaucrats who are known as the *ultras*, is getting smaller and more isolated; furthermore it is not united, the generals favouring an implacable military dictatorship and the bureaucrats of the Falange offering a return to the fascist mythology of "national syndicalism" complete with blue shirts and, one supposes, a return of the terror, as if 1966 were 1936. There are others around Franco, notably those Ministers belonging to the *Opus Dei* organisation, who would prefer to be without the Falangist element in the government, but are equally afraid that the slightest crack, at this stage, would bring disaster for them. Franco meanwhile, apart from Ministerial reshuffles, offers no solution but *inaction*, maintaining the *status quo* as long as possible, serene in the assurance that none of his supporters can do without him.

The Opus Dei Ministers are among those on the Right who favour "liberalisation"—but without political change. They are impelled in this direction by economic considerations. The Spanish economy, so dependent on Europe, is powerfully drawn towards the giant monopolies of the European Common Market; these do not know how to solve Spain's present economic problems, but figure that since the Franco regime is an obstacle to their credit in the European market they had better "Europeanise" it a little, give it a liberal tint, raise the living standards of some of the population and create a comfortable middle class in city and countryside which would avert the menace of real democracy.

There has been much talk of this "liberalisation" of the regime. But every victory that has so far been won has been wrested from the government by the unity and mass action of the working class and the people. And this alone offers proof that the Spanish Communist Party is correct when it says that a change in the direction of democracy can be brought about, without violence, through the increasingly powerful mass movement of the working class and all democratic forces.

"We do not intend to start a discussion about the manner in which the Franco regime will be liquidated", writes Santiago Carrillo, "nor is it a question of overestimating his possibilities nor those of the oligarchy. It is a question of noting what happens at every moment in order to urge on, organise and unite the democratic forces and masses, making them conscious of their strength and of the democratic objectives which correspond to the present stage and bringing them into action".

Tasks of the Movement

How is this to be done? writes Carrillo. He details, one by one, the tasks which must be undertaken to broaden and extend the present movement among the Spanish people. Every economic demand of the working class must be helped forward, he explains, and not just those which are common to the whole of industry: every separate industry, each factory and workshop has particular problems, and it would be unrealistic to think that the more advanced can automatically lead the backward by their example or that general improvements will follow particular victories.

The same applies to the movement among the artists, intellectuals and the professional people. "The solidarity shown by these people towards the working class movement is an indication of the deep political feeling among them, and their growing sense that the intellectuals and the manual workers have the same interests regardless of the difference between the work they do. . . . We must not forget, though, that the intellectuals have often come into the struggle by reason of the need they feel to achieve liberty for their own creative work—and this means the ending of the censorship, the restrictions and vetoes imposed on them by the dominant group." Carrillo reminds his readers that many intellectuals, moreover, cannot satisfy their material needs with their creative work and have to take other jobs which often sap their creative energy.

Very sharp problems face other sectors of the Spanish population too. Housing, rents, public health and state education are among the most acute of these. Housewives are already up in arms against the rising cost of living; government spokesmen have quite openly expressed the intention of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowing inflation to reduce the value of wage increases. The middle class, the small and medium bourgeoisie and even the non-monopoly capitalists are all facing difficulties, and all can be won to find the democratic solution, to take part in the broad united struggle against the dictatorship and the monopolies.

Strict attention must be paid by every communist, writes Santiago Carrillo, to the need to respect and keep in mind the opinions of their allies in this movement, never to press them further than they can go, never to impose communist criteria on them, always to try and understand their doubts and hesitations and to convince them by friendly persuasion and analysis. "To be a member of the Communist Party is to be part of the conscious vanguard of the working class . . . with a global concept of the world and a line and tactics in keeping with this concept . . . the Party demands more from its members than other groups and organisations do of theirs", and this means that "we must sometimes be doubly conscious of the need for unity, both for ourselves and for our allies".

There is probably no other sector of the country which suffers more sharply from the consequences of the Franco regime than the peasants and agricultural workers—and perhaps no other which feels a greater rage and indignation against it, writes Carrillo of the need to increase Communist work in the countryside. Agricultural prices, taxes, the monopoly of the market; high prices and dear credits; high land rents; the problem of the *phoney co-operatives* (a kind of limited companies controlled by the big landowners); the control of water supplies by the landowners; and a thousand other problems such as sanitation, health services, unemployment insurance and state education which are common to all working people but even sharper in the countryside than in the cities—all these must be tackled. And the agrarian reform—the land to the tiller—is the solution not merely to the problems of the peasants but to the whole problem of the Spanish economy. "The day when a leap forward is taken in this terrain similar to the leap that has already taken place among the workers and students, the forces moving against the Franco regime will be all-powerful and invincible."

The Political Parties in the Present Situation

In speaking of the crisis of the Franco regime and the new developments in the opposition movement, it is necessary, says Carrillo, to take a look at the various political parties and groups. As in other countries where the political and social system is falling to pieces, there is a proliferation of small groups, splinter movements and sects. These are of little importance, for they are either fragments of what is about to disappear, or embryos which will come to nothing.

The "National Movement" is now little more than a name. But there does exist in Spain an older, traditional, reactionary Right which identifies its own interests and privileges with those of the nation, which is fiercely anti-democratic and is recruited from the financial and landowning circles, from certain Catholic elements and from some sectors of the Army and the State bureaucracy. Its mass influence is declining and divisions are appearing in its midst. The monarchists form part of this Right but they ceased to operate as a party (or parties) some time ago and show no signs of re-forming. The Right also includes the sect known as Opus Dei, though some of the younger members of this body are turning towards more liberal policies. Franco remains head of this old Right although it cannot be said that he enjoys enthusiastic support. His increasing age, the precarious situation of the government and its economic uncertainties are all keeping the Right on a bed of thorns.

A neo-Right is emerging from among the "liberalisers" to whom reference has been made. This is viewed by the old Right with deep unease. Where is it going to stop, this "liberalisation", this "Europeanisation", they ask? Might it not open the door to universal suffrage and political freedom? Though one could quote names, says Carrillo, this group is not yet an organised body with a common political programme; it is more a state of mind, born of the desire to ensure that the dissolution of the dictatorship should not become the dissolution of the dominant social groups.

The Falange, as stated above, has been reduced to a state bureaucracy—one part of it mixed up with the traditional Right and another with the neo-Right; there is a younger section of the Falange which is openly anti-Franco and professes a vaguely democratic policy mixed up with nostalgic Fascist dreams.

Of the traditional Spanish parties, one part—the Republican parties—has practically disappeared. The remnants of these are in exile and have little or no influence inside the country—not because the Spanish people want a return to the Monarchy but because the Republican parties have lost their dynamism and been left behind by history, having shown themselves incapable of acting as a ferment of resistance inside the country or as a unifying factor in the emigration. To disregard these exiled institutions is in no way to belittle the Republic, says Santiago Carrillo; it is to demand the new, democratic Republic which Spain needs, which cannot be attained by a simple return to the past.

The Socialist Party is in the throes of a serious crisis which has gone on unresolved for years. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater part of its political activity is carried out in exile, mainly in the sphere of the international social-democratic movement. Inside the country it has managed to re-group some of its forces in the Basque Country, where it is known as ASE (Alianza Sindical Euzkadi) and enjoys some support from Basque nationalism; and in Catalonia where it is called ASO (Alianza Sindical Obrera) and is sustained by Catholic militants. But in neither case does it justify the efforts made by some of the western press to raise its prestige nor the economic aid it receives from international trade union bodies. Inside the country the veteran Socialists largely confine themselves to writing letters when asked to do so by their leadership in Toulouse and *awaiting their hour*. Among university and professional circles there are some small new groups being formed which call themselves socialist and which correspond with socialist organisations and personalities abroad without the aid of Toulouse, which tends to view them with suspicion.

Why has the Socialist Party not grown in these years of great movement? asks Carrillo. The main cause is still to be found in the policy of the Toulouse leadership which maintains an anti-communist line and thinks of the future in terms of the past. The Communists do not view this crisis with any satisfaction, for it weakens the democratic struggle. A socialist party with a leftward, unity-inclined policy could play a far more positive role than that of the Socialist Party today. Spanish communists will continue to seek contact and dialogue with their socialist comrades and do whatever it can in unity with them. Inside Spain cordial relations exist in many instances and common actions have been carried out. The further growth of the mass movement will make this unity easier to achieve.

The Christian Democrats

The Catholic Church has ceased to identify itself with the Franco regime, writes Carrillo, and this has influenced different sectors of the population with differing effect and intensity. It has contributed towards the breaking of the adherence to the regime of certain conservative sectors and moved them towards liberalisation; it has facilitated the taking up of a more active opposition by both workers and intellectuals. It has also brought about conditions for a broadening of the dialogue and united action between believers and non-believers, Catholics and Communists, which has been going on for a long time. In furtherance of their policy of reconciliation, and in recognition of the influence of Catholicism in Spain, the Communists have long striven for this dialogue and unity; this is in no way a question of tactics, but corresponds to their whole strategy and their concept of the path to socialism.

It would not be true, of course, to say that the whole Church has adopted a democratic stand. A complex and difficult struggle, initiated by Pope John, is being waged to bring the Church up to date. The interests of Spain demand that this trend should triumph. As a result of these changes groups are coming to the fore which can be classified under the heading of Christian Democracy, though they are not yet sufficiently united to become a party. There is a young and active sector animated by the teaching of Pope John which is not merely against the regime but against the injustices of capitalist society. It includes a number of priests, and a great number of lay people who are making a positive contribution to the organisation of mass struggle among the workers and in university and intellectual circles.

"We know that these men are inspired by the desire to raise the prestige of the Church and of Spanish Catholicism", writes Santiago Carrillo. "This does not surprise us, for from their writing and their actions . . . we are convinced that they are animated by the sincere wish to defend with their own beliefs the interests of the people and the disinherited."

For the first time in Spanish history, he concludes, the possibility arises of Catholic participation in this current of renewal, coinciding with the similar movement in the rest of the world. There is still powerful resistance to change both in the Spanish and the world Church; it is even possible that the Spanish Neo-Right may endeavour to form a Christian Democratic movement in its own support. But life, practice and the scientific and social conquests of mankind will show who is right. "As regards political, social and material progress . . . Spain can only win if we go forward along the road of collaboration between Catholics and Marxists."

Perspectives for the Future

In the second half of his book, Santiago Carrillo outlines in detail the "Spanish road to Socialism" as envisaged by the Communist Party. The immediate objectives, the minimum conditions for a free regime, include an amnesty for all political prisoners and exiles, recognition of the right to strike, trade union freedom, freedom of press, speech and association, freedom of conscience and recognition of universal suffrage as the source of political power. A democratic regime would naturally re-establish the autonomy of Catalonia and the Basque country and extend it to Galicia, and make preparations for a constitutional government.

A "New Democracy" is envisaged by the Communists, with a multi-Party Parliamentary system. In Spain the monopoly capitalist system for historical reasons has developed more sharply than in more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advanced capitalist countries, mixed moreover with the strong feudal remnants existing in agriculture.

Consequently the State is not the defender of the entire bourgeoisie but only of its monopoly sector; the Franco regime openly declares that the small proprietor ought not to exist but should allow himself to be swallowed up by the "great units of production" in the name of technical progress. The non-monopoly capitalist in Spain lacks all political representation and faces ruin at the hands of the monopolies. The monopolies have brought agriculture to a state of chronic crisis. Thus the struggle against monopoly capital and the remnants of feudalism in agriculture can embrace very wide sectors of the people. The Spanish Communists envisage their participation not only in the struggle for democracy but in the new regime which will replace the present one: an anti-feudal, anti-monopoly New Democracy, with a multi-party parliamentary system, with the right of self-determination for Spain's minority nationalities, with a democratic judicial system, free trade unions, a reformed agriculture (the land to the tiller) and a Republic of a new type. The non-monopoly bourgeoisie can help Spain to make the transition to modern life as the first step along the path to socialism.

Here is the way forward for Spain as charted by the Spanish Communist Party. It can truly be said that no other party or group has one-tenth so clear an idea either of the situation or of its solution. "The way to change is opening as a result of the activity of the most powerful and energetic of the democratic forces. This will be a complex process; but it is taking place, *and we are in it*."

World Hunger and Economic "Aid"

Idris Cox

DURING recent months, the British press, radio and TV have been giving publicity to the problem of world hunger. This has been presented as the biggest social problem facing the world today, and new efforts are being made to revive the Malthus theory that population increases at a faster rate than food supplies.

Any realistic portrayal of the extent of world hunger has a big moral appeal. There is certainly a need to arouse the moral consciousness of the British people, and of the world as a whole, to this problem, but it is not just a moral and human problem—it has deep economic and political roots. Moral attitudes have little value unless they go to the roots of the problem.

Official estimates of the United Nations reveal that half the world's population of 1,500 million suffers poverty and hunger. This is concentrated mainly in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In other words, it is the remaining colonies, and those which have won political independence during the past 20 years, which are the most seriously affected. It is in precisely these countries that the so-called "population explosion" has made its biggest impact.

If one takes the official estimates on population in the past 300 years, one gets a striking picture: the world population in 1830 was estimated at 1,000 million. From 1830 to 1930 the population rose a further 1,000 million, reaching a total of 2,000 million—an average increase of 10 million a year. Since 1930 the population has risen a further 1,000 million—an average increase of about 30 million a year. Today the world population total stands at 3,000 million and is estimated to increase a further 3,000 million in the next 34 years, making a total of 6,000 million.

However, it is important to recognise that the bulk of this increase has been in Asia, Africa and Latin America, whose total population is now 2,000 million (two-thirds of the world) and it is estimated it will reach 5,000 million by the year 2,000 (five-sixths of the whole world).

The United Nations publications also estimate that the world at present produces 50 per cent more food than it did 30 years ago, but since the population has gone up by 35 per cent, the real food increase is only 15 per cent. This increased food supply is produced almost entirely by the *developed* countries, capitalist and socialist. Taken as a whole, food production in undeveloped countries is lower, and the gap between them becoming even wider. The table below roughly illustrates this:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Region	*Per cent of world population*	*Per cent of world food supply*	*Per cent of world income*
Far East	52.4	27.3	12.3
Near East	4.4	4.2	1.8
Africa	7.3	4.3	2.2
Latin America ..	6.8	6.2	4.7
Europe	21.9	34.5	37.7
North America ..	6.7	22.0	39.8
Oceania	0.5	1.3	1.5
Totals:	100.0	100.0	100.0

It should be borne in mind that these United Nations estimates are not necessarily correct in every respect. The actual regions conceal some essential factors. The Far East covers the Asian territories of the Soviet Union and China, and the situation there is obviously very different from India, Pakistan and Ceylon. Furthermore, there is no separate estimation of food supplies and incomes in the socialist world. At the same time, this presentation does give a general outline of the contrasting situation on a geographical scale.

Roots of the Problem

There is a great temptation to give allegiance to the Malthus theory that the population increases in geometrical proportion as against food supply increasing only in arithmetical proportion.[1] But the UN figures make clear (even if this theory were accepted) that this is not universal. It applies almost entirely to the undeveloped countries, and makes clear that world hunger arises from economic and political factors rather than from population growth.

The undeveloped countries comprise the greater part of the earth's surface, only 10 per cent of which is cultivated, though they depend mainly on agriculture. The developed countries of Europe have a bigger proportion of land for growing crops, and so has the United States, Canada, and Australia. The proportion in Europe is 31 per cent compared to 18 per cent in Asia. In the United States and Canada together it is 11 per cent as against 9 per cent in Africa and only 5 per cent in Latin America.

Even greater is the contrast in agricultural output and food production, for large-scale mechanised agriculture in the capitalist world is concentrated almost entirely in Europe, United States, Canada, and Australia. Primitive methods still remain in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Moreover, the undeveloped countries have to export nearly their entire crop of primary products (coffee, cocoa, cotton, rubber, palm products, groundnuts etc.) to pay for the import of capital and manufactured goods. But the capitalist world market, through the medium of the "General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs" (GATT) is geared to force down the prices of primary goods and to push up the prices of capital and manufactured goods.

A simple illustration is the *increased volume* of primary goods which had to be exported in 1961 compared with 1951 to pay for one ton of imported steel:

Product	*1951*	*1961*	*Per cent increase*
Ghana (lbs. of cocoa) ..	202	571	283
Brazil (lbs. of coffee) ..	158	380	240
Malaya (lbs. of rubber)..	132	441	334

True, there are extremely high prices for oil, copper, gold, and diamonds (which come mainly from undeveloped countries) but the enterprises which produce these are almost entirely in the hands of foreign monopoly firms. Governments of the independent states get a small share from royalties, which in most cases are based on the lower *producer* price (as in oil) rather than the higher *selling* price from which the monopolies make fabulous profits.

It seems clear therefore, that the widening gap between the economy and the living standards of developed and undeveloped countries is not due primarily to population changes. It arises from the system of imperialist exploitation which still exists even after countries have won political independence.

Independence and After

The big challenge facing newly independent states is to transform their old, backward colonial economies into independent, balanced economies, based on large-scale industrial enterprise, and the diversification of their agriculture. This is a difficult and colossal task, involving an even bigger challenge to imperialism than the fight for political independence. For it means an intensified struggle *on all fronts*—economic, political, military, ideological—against the imperialist strategy of neo-colonialism. Far from ending the political struggle, every advance towards economic transformation makes it sharper than ever before, as has been made clear by recent developments in Ghana.

Independent states are faced with the challenge of building either a capitalist economy, or advancing on their own particular road to socialism. They cannot become independent capitalist economies because they lack the necessary financial resources and a developed bourgeoisie. So along this road there is nothing but a new form of subservience to imperialism.

Independent states cannot advance on the road to socialism unless they resist all forms of imperialist

[1] On this matter I am in agreement with the article by Ivor Montagu which appeared in the June issue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressure, and carry out decisive measures to build their own independent economy. This means:

(i) giving first and main place in their economic plans to the state and co-operative sector of production;
(ii) taking effective safeguards against foreign loans and investments undermining their economic plans and the growth of the state sector;
(iii) taking full advantage to expand trade with socialist countries and possibilities of socialist economic aid.

Bigger Exploitation

During the past decade the plain fact is that imperialist exploitation of the undeveloped countries had increased at a rapid rate. While eloquent speeches have been delivered in the United Nations and in the whole of the capitalist world on the need to alleviate world hunger, this system of robbery has reached a new high level.

Let us first take the direct profit from private foreign investment. Official accounts do not give the full story, but they reveal sufficient to make clear the enormous scope of this rising exploitation.

At the present rate United States foreign investments are likely to reach the colossal figure of £3,500 million this year, an increase of 50 per cent over 1964. The total book value of United States foreign investments is put at £22,400 million, but the real market value is more in the region of £32,000 million. This is nearly half as much again, and is equal to £160 per head for every man, woman and child in the United States.

From these foreign investments come vast profits of over £3,000 million a year, equal to £16 per head —though the ordinary man and woman in the United States does not get this! This profit alone is far greater than the "economic aid" extended by the United States. This is to say nothing of the vast indirect gains from the system of robbery on the capitalist world market arising from the declining prices of primary goods from the undeveloped countries and the increasing prices of capital and manufactured goods which they have to import from the developed countries.

True, the bulk of United States foreign investments are in Canada, Europe (including about £1,400 million in Britain), and Australia. But there is also a considerable proportion in Middle East oil, in the precious minerals of the Congo, in Rhodesian copper, and South African gold and diamonds; in North African oil, and in India and the Caribbean territories.

British authorities are even more adept than the Americans in concealing the real amount of foreign assets and profits which come from them. After many years of cloudy speculation the official Bank of England journal for December, 1964, mustered enough courage to give a new assessment of total British private assets abroad. For 1962 they were £8,075 million, far in excess of all previous estimates. Even so, it was below the real total. The journal had to admit:

> ". . . the effect of the incompleteness or unavailability of statistics for several important items is undoubtedly to understate United Kingdom external assets more seriously than the external liabilities."

What are the "important items" left out? The estimate for oil investments is only £1,100 million—less than the capital assets of even one British oil monopoly firm. For insurance it is only £350 million, and that is confined only to the United States. A full account would reveal that total British overseas assets are far greater even than the estimate of the Bank of England in December 1964.

In its December 1965 issue the journal gives a higher total of £9,420 million in 1964 (1,325 million higher in two years), with only £200 million more for oil and £45 million more for insurance in the United States.

Even so, all these estimates deal with the "book value" of foreign assets, not their real value. When the *Financial Times* on July 13th, 1964, commented on an earlier account (November 1963) in the Board of Trade journal of the distribution of British direct investments abroad, the Chief Executive Officer of the Malayan Rubber Growers' Association sent in a pointed letter stating that the estimate for Malaya was far too low.

The estimate of British investments in Malaya was £102 million. The letter pointed out that investments in Malayan rubber alone were £130 million, and the total of all investments in Malaya was at least £260 million, and expressed the view that even this figure was "too low".

Earlier this year *The Times*' City Editor made a survey of the "disclosed" earnings of big British banks for 1965, in contrast to their real earnings. Most of these banks deal extensively with financial operations abroad, and it is interesting to ponder on *The Times* version of their "disclosed" earnings, and their "real" earnings:

	Disclosed earnings	*Estimated real earnings*
Midland Bank	18.0	53
Lloyds Bank	14.4	38
Barclays Bank	21.0	51
Westminster Bank . .	22.5	43
Martins Bank	19.6	39
Nat. Provincial Bank . .	28.9	48
Royal Bank of Scotland . .	27.3	37

Taking all these together the average share profit disclosed was 21.7 per cent, but the real earnings were approximately 44 per cent—over double.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Though it is still a matter of intelligent guesswork as to the actual total and rate of profit from British investments abroad, a diligent search of official reports does give some clue. Those who argue that profits from British investments abroad help to ease the balance of payments problem sometimes let the cat out of the bag. Three years ago, Mr. Peter Walker, Tory MP, did this in the House of Commons:

> "We talk of invisible earnings bringing in only £200 million or showing a deficit, but we should point out that invisible earnings in fact last year amounted to more than £2,000 million." (*Hansard*, May 24th, 1963.)

A more recent example is a speech by Sir Donald Stokes, to the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce:

> "Britain's invisible exports in 1964, at £2,616 million were equal to half the total exports. The surplus over invisible imports would have been around £600 million but for Government overseas spending of £480 million." (*Daily Telegraph*, April 18th, 1966.)

What are these "invisible exports"? Apart from interest, profits and dividends from overseas investment they include shipping services, insurance, civil aviation, private transfers, and various financial transactions. For 1965 the total came to £2,792 million, which was £129 million more than it was in 1964. The March 1966 issue of *Economic Trends* (HMSO) gives a five-year table from 1961-65 of "Invisible Transactions", which reveals that overseas interest, profits and dividends rose from £676 million in 1961 to £991 million in 1965. This was also £95 million above the 1964 level.

At the first annual dinner of the Confederation of British Industry on May 18th, 1966, Lord Cromer, Governor of the Bank of England, was critical of the Government's appeal for a voluntary cut in private overseas investment, and praised the value to Britain of "invisible earnings".

He claimed that the two biggest items in the "invisible balance" were the services performed by "the City", and income from overseas investments. Together they had "in this decade brought in net amounts varying from a low of £350 million in 1956, to a high of some £650 million in 1965" (*Financial Times*, May 19th, 1966).

This is nearly double the net figure of 1956, and £50 million more than it was two years ago. Lord Cromer also explained that the 1965 figure included £200 million derived mainly from London's position as an international financial centre.

In an earlier speech in February 1966, Lord Cromer had the following to say about overseas earnings and the "adverse" trade balance:

> "The total net earnings of the United Kingdom under this heading of private invisibles increased from just over £500 million in 1957 to over £650 million in 1964; this large increase over the period is accounted for in the main by an increase in the investment income from overseas."

The term "net earnings" is a useful dodge to conceal real earnings. Total earnings in 1965 from shipping (£726 million), other services like banking (£558 million) and interest, profits and dividends (£991 million) came to £2,355 million. But debits to other countries are deducted from this total to make "net earnings" of £758 million, though real earnings are at least three times as much!

True, the bulk of British overseas investments are in the more developed countries. Nearly 30 per cent are in the United States, Europe and South Africa. Over 60 per cent are in Commonwealth countries, mainly in Canada and Australia. But there is a substantial proportion of investment also in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Malaysia, Rhodesia, and Nigeria.

It would therefore be incorrect to conclude that most of the direct profits from British overseas investments (or even the larger total of £2,792 for "invisible" earnings) comes *directly* from the undeveloped countries. However, even British profits from developed countries represent an *indirect* share of the imperialist exploitation of the undeveloped countries.

But there is another channel through which the imperialist states are able to engage in a vast robbery of the undeveloped countries. This is through the process, deliberately propped up by the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), which enables them to force down the prices of primary products from the undeveloped countries and force up the prices of capital and manufactured goods which they have to import.

According to a United Nations' estimate the undeveloped countries between 1951 and 1961 lost no less than $13,000 million (or £5,200 million) through this process. At the Geneva Conference on Trade and Development (UNTAD) in 1964, it was emphasised that at this rate of increased robbery the undeveloped countries would lose $7,000 million (or £2,800 million) in 1970 in that year alone.

Since 1964 the gap between primary product prices of the undeveloped countries and capital and manufactured goods from the developed countries had become even wider. The decline in Ghana's cocoa prices from £467 per ton in 1952-54 to £85 per ton last year was the decisive factor in reducing her foreign reserves, which had a disastrous effect on the economy. This underlines the fact that the serious economic situation in Ghana before the military *coup* in February was due almost entirely to these external conditions rather than to internal factors.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Economic "Aid"

In contrast to the mounting profits from United States and British overseas investments the amounts allocated for so-called economic "aid" schemes have steadily declined in recent years. The latest report of the *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development* (OECD) makes this clear. This apparatus comprises all the countries in western Europe (13 in all), together with Canada and the United States, and each has its own economic "aid" scheme.

Their combined economic aid total dropped from £2,282 million in 1963 to £2,222 million in 1964, of which the United States accounts for more than 60 per cent. Some totals increased slightly in 1964, but the United States' drop from £1,534 million to £1,408 million was far greater than the increased amounts.

For the eight years from 1956-63 inclusive the total United States "foreign aid" programme amounted to £9,016 million, dropping from an annual average of £2,000 million in the late 1950s, to roughly £1,200 million for the current year—only 40 per cent of the profits from overseas investment.

However, United States "foreign aid" includes military assistance, mainly to "countries bordering on the Soviet Union and China", and even the sums for "economic aid" include projects which have a military aim. For the current year the £1,200 million allocated is officially divided, for the first time, between £880 million economic and £327 million military aid.

Even this is an extremely thin screen which can hardly conceal the vastly greater sums allocated by the United States for military purposes. Early in May 1966 the Pentagon estimated that £1,840 million would be spent in Vietnam in the current fiscal year. And with the escalation of the war this would jump to £4,120 million in the next fiscal year. This is nearly *five times* the official total for economic "aid".

This is by no means the whole story. The magazine *Fortune* recently made a computation that the United States cost of the Vietnam war *at its present level* was £5,480 million and in the next fiscal year would be at the rate of £7,600 million! (*Financial Times*, May 20th, 1966.)

It is openly admitted that United States "foreign aid" has a definite political and military aim. The Clay Committee appointed by President Kennedy presented a report early in 1963 which made this quite clear. So much so that the London *Times* (March 28th, 1963) made this editorial comment:

> "American aid is not just aid, but part of foreign policy. The committee calculated that 44 per cent of American aid was military and economic support for allied countries bordering the communist bloc, and if the sums spent in Vietnam and Laos are included, the share of total appropriations comes to 72 per cent."

That was over three years ago, long before the "escalation" of the past year and the proposed future escalation. In face of this, one is entitled to the conclusion that United States "economic aid" is a mere fragment of its "foreign aid" programme.

In some respects it is easier to distinguish the forms of British economic "aid". They arise from a number of separate legal enactments which last year were combined in the Overseas Development Act. The total amount for the 18 years 1946-64 came to £1,367 million, an average of £76 million a year. In the first half of this period the annual average was even smaller, and in recent years ranged from £160 million to £190 million. For the current year 1966-67 the target is set at £225 million—less than *one-tenth* the combined profit from overseas private investments and "invisible" transactions in 1965.

Even this all-round figure of £225 million is only two-thirds of the one per cent of national income often pledged in Labour's official policy, not to mention Harold Wilson's plea a decade ago to raise it to 2 per cent. The new total is certainly above that of 1965. But global figures conceal the real picture, for in recent years the proportion of actual grants has constantly declined while that of loans at high interest rates has increased, and loans now form the bulk of British economic "aid".

Mr. Anthony Greenwood, who replaced Barbara Castle as Minister of Overseas Defence after the General Election this March, has emphasised that "For the most part bilateral aid to independent countries is in the form of loans for their development" (*Hansard*, May 17th, 1966). The exact proportion for 1966 was not disclosed, but the trend in recent years is clear. In 1963 the proportion of British "bilateral aid" in the form of loans was 40 per cent; in 1964 it was 66 per cent, and in 1965 it was 77 per cent.

As early as May 1963, Mr. G. M. Thompson (now Minister for Foreign Affairs) complained in Parliament that "28 per cent of British aid goes to pay back the interest on former aid". The interest on these loans ranges from 5 to 7 per cent, and in time becomes a heavy burden on the recipients. Conscious of this problem, Barbara Castle brought in a Bill in June 1965 to empower the Ministry to advance "selective interest-free loans" in special cases, or to waive payment of interest for the first few years. However, Mr. Greenwood made clear that interest payments expected on past loans will be higher in 1966 than ever before:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> "Repayments on development loans made in the past will be somewhat higher this year than last, so that the net cost of the programme will not increase by as much as £25 million." (*Hansard*, May 17th, 1966.)

It is no wonder that Mr. Greenwood in the same speech drew attention to the problem of the new independent states whose ". . . overseas debts are beyond the strength of local foreign exchange resources". This, in fact, is a masterly understatement! A survey by "Lombard" in the *Financial Times* on January 7th, 1966, put this problem far more bluntly:

> ". . . between now and the early 1970s the underdeveloped countries as a whole are due to repay from a quarter to a half of their foreign debt. And, as this is estimated to be in the region of $24,000 million (£9,800 million) it is not difficult to imagine what this is going to mean for countries whose combined annual export earnings do not usually amount to much more than $33,000 million (£13,200 million)."

The OECD annual review for 1965 estimates this debt is increasing at the rate of 17 per cent every year. For 37 countries "covering roughly three-quarters of the (non-Sino-Soviet) less developed world" interest payments (plus amortisation) alone increased from $700 million (£280 million) in 1956 to $2,700 million (£1,080 million) in 1964.

It is estimated that the £1,080 million interest payments in 1964 will increase by another £650 million between now and 1970! Bearing in mind that the "Freedom from Hunger" campaign raised only £6 million in the past *five* years (a penny a head for 1,500 million suffering from starvation), this brings out the pathetic futility of its efforts.

Of course, there are also so-called "multilateral" agencies for economic "aid". These include the World Bank and the United Nations Special Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED). But the contribution of the OECD countries to these agencies in 1964 was only 6 per cent of their bilateral aid, and makes hardly any impact on the problem—except to divert attention from the real solution.

In January 1966, the Governing Council of the United Nations' Development Programme (UNDP) reported that a comparatively tiny sum of $1,407 million (£562 million) had been allocated since 1959 for 604 projects in 61 countries. Most of these projects were for surveys—39 per cent, training—37 per cent, research—21 per cent, and only 3 per cent for economic development planning!

For 1966 it allocated $254 million (£102 million), the biggest amount ever in one year for 82 "pre-investment projects"—less than 3 per cent of estimated U.S. overseas investment this year.

The term "pre-investment projects" is in itself quite revealing, for the main aim of UNDP is to assist the infrastructure (roads, irrigation, water supplies), which provides cheap public services. In the long run these projects serve a useful purpose for the recipients, but in the short run are extremely useful for foreign monopoly firms. United Nations and OECD many years back made clear what their real aim is. In its 1951 report on development plans in tropical Africa the OECD gave this contrast between "private" and "public" capital:

> "Many productive enterprises necessitate the prior instalment of a large quantity of basic equipment which requires a large amount of capital, and it often happens that no profit can be earned for many years to come. This is why private capital is sometimes not forthcoming and why public capital has had to take its place, as it has done in a variety of fields."

The aim of SUNFED is also to provide "public" capital to pave the way for private capital:

> "There must be a minimum of roads, power stations, schools, hospitals, housing and government buildings. Experience has shown that it is only when this basis has been established that production can be developed smoothly and that *private initiative* can play its full part." (*United Nations Bulletin*, June 1955.)

The World Bank's official report for 1946-53 points out:

> "Most of the Bank's loans are for basic utilities . . . highroads, railways, power facilities, irrigation and reclamation projects and the like . . . which are an *essential* for the growth of *private* enterprise . . ."

The aim was to raise the standards of health and education, for even the foreign monopoly firms were in need of a more educated and skilled labour force. Even so, these schools and hospitals, few as they are, constitute an important and lasting asset for the new states.

Against this general background one is now able to estimate to what extent economic "aid" alleviates world hunger, and assists in promoting economic growth and higher living standards. There is no simple Yes or No answer to this problem.

In any case, it seems fairly clear that the main solution depends on the extent to which the new states are able to harness their own resources and plan their economy so as to advance towards socialism without going through the long and painful process of capitalist development. The capitalist economy has already made considerable advances in varying degrees in all the new states.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So it is not a matter of entirely by-passing capitalism, but of restricting its development in favour of decisive measures which can lead to a socialist economy.

This means drastic land reform where feudalism or other forms of large-scale private land ownership prevails, and is replaced by the growth of co-operative and state farms. It means a planned economy in which first place is given to the state and co-operative sector of production. It means striving to develop large-scale production in industry and agriculture, the growth of a skilled working class, and effective control of internal and foreign trade.

This is by no means an easy task, even assuming that the leaders of the new states favour these aims and are determined to apply these measures. In practice, even many who gave lip-service to these aims are constantly being enticed by foreign imperialism, with its strategy of neo-colonialism, to abandon the non-capitalist path and put themselves at the mercy of foreign monopoly.

Of course socialist economic aid is of tremendous value, for it is basically different from all the so-called schemes for economic aid. It has no interest in extracting profits. Its main concern is to assist in transforming the backward economy and expanding the state and co-operative sector of production. Moreover, loans and credits are extended on extremely favourable terms, either interest free or at the low average rate of 2 per cent compared with the 5 to 7 per cent charged by the imperialist countries.

However, one must face the fact that socialist economic aid is not possible on a big enough scale to solve the economic problems of the new states. At the most it can only *assist* the internal economic developments in a socialist direction. Also, it must be borne in mind that the political attitude of most of the leaders of the new states[2] is not conducive to large-scale economic aid from the socialist countries.

From the Marxist standpoint there is no moral argument against the new states taking over all foreign assets, and *without* compensation. The extent to which they have been robbed is many times greater than the total assets of all foreign firms. But to take this step is not so easy as it sounds.

First, few leaders of the new states are prepared to do this. Second, even if they were, they have to take into account what would be the repercussions, bearing in mind that their *main* economic relations are still with capitalist countries.

There is another important factor. The bulk of British foreign investments are in the United States, Canada and Australia. Of the smaller proportion in the new states they are mainly in India, Ceylon, Malaysia, Singapore, Aden and Nigeria. British investments in the two white settler countries of South Africa and Rhodesia, and in the Congo, are more than the combined total in the eight new African states of Ghana, Sierra Leone, Gambia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and Lesotho.

Only in a few of the new states (apart from Cuba) have the political leaders taken the step of nationalising foreign enterprises. This process is most advanced in Egypt. It has taken place on a considerable scale in Algeria, and on a smaller scale in Ghana. In all the other new states there will need to be a far more rapid advance of political maturity before similar steps can be taken.

However, one has to face the fact that the main robbery of the new states, especially in tropical Africa, is through the process of the capitalist world market by which the prices of primary products are forced downwards and the prices of capital and manufactured goods which they have to import are pushed upwards.

This underlines the prime importance of the second UNTAD Conference due next year, at which the 77 undeveloped countries (as they did at the first Geneva conference in April-June 1964) are likely to press even more strongly their demands for more equitable prices on the world market for their primary products. They will get the support of the socialist countries (as they did in 1964) but only rising mass pressure can force the British and other capitalist countries to accede even to this demand.

As for the various economic "aid" schemes, these are of little or no value (and even detrimental to the new states) unless they are completely changed in character. At the existing commercial rates of interest the new states *cannot afford* to accept new loans. Even the payment of interest on past loans has become an intolerable burden. *The only sensible course is outright grants and interest free loans to the new states.*

Given the present political relation of world forces, most of the new states still welcome foreign investments, but it seems clear there is no advantage to be gained from them unless they are under the *strict control* of the new states, and providing foreign investments conform to their own economic plans and are geared to the aim of expanding more rapidly the growth of the state and co-operative sector.

The progressive demand in Britain should be two-fold in character:

1. More equitable prices on the world market, and
2. Outright grants and interest free loans.

In their present form the economic "aid" schemes

[2] Earlier this year the Kenya Government refused to accept a new trade agreement proposed by the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot possibly assist in solving the economic problem of the new states and raising their living standards.

To achieve these demands involves a far sharper political mass struggle against the whole imperialist policy of the Wilson Government, and a much higher level of solidarity with all aspects of the struggle being waged by the new states to transform their backward economies and raise their living standards.

This is not simply a matter of political sympathy but of a united fight in the common interests of the British people and those millions in the new states suffering from hunger and poverty. As long as Britain is based on an imperialist economy, exploiting the British workers and millions of people in the new states, there can be no basic solution for its problems.

Side by side with the fight for world peace, the problem of world hunger is the outstanding challenge of the last decades of the 20th century. Unless this challenge is faced in Britain and other capitalist countries, existing living standards (so far above those of the new states) will not be maintained, let alone improved. If we ignore this challenge, it will be at our own peril.

Discussion Contributions on:

Laws of Dialectics

Raymond Southall

THE discussion of the Laws of Dialectics has revealed a surprising divergence of opinion amongst Marxists on a number of semi-philosophic issues. A review of the discussion, prior to the appearance of Steadman's contribution, indicates two principal causes of this diversity.

Disagreements have arisen in part because contributors have chosen to discuss subjects of which they have little, if any, knowledge: Formal Logic, for example, and, I strongly suspect, Laws of Nature. Maurice Cornforth appears to believe that we can imagine the suspension of the Law of Gravity. Can we really? If the law was suspended what do we imagine would happen to the relationship of bodies within the solar system? And what would happen to the relationship between this and other systems? I simply *cannot* imagine and neither, I suspect, can Maurice Cornforth. He believes that we can imagine such an eventuality because he thinks of gravitation unscientifically; he does not think of it as a constant determining relations within and between systems, but as the layman does, as a force which keeps our feet firmly planted on the ground.

The failure to make necessary distinctions has been the second factor producing a riot of conflicting opinions where one had a right to expect disciplined discussion. I want to consider some of these distinctions before turning to Mike Steadman's contribution.

Psychology and Logic

Firstly, and most importantly, it seems necessary to distinguish different kinds of interest. One can consider the formulations which express Laws of Nature and of Dialectics from different points of view: one can be interested in their logic, in their truth and falsity and the nature of this; in their epistomology, with how we know or claim to know that which they express; in their psychology, with the processes of reasoning and inference which led to such formulations.

The failure to observe the distinction between logic and psychology is well illustrated in D.N.L.'s contribution to the present discussion. Many people experience spleen when confronted with a logician, but that is no excuse for wilfully confusing questions of thinking and inferring with questions of logic. Logical analysis is not a surreptitious form of psychological analysis:

> "Reasoning is the special kind of thinking called inferring, in which conclusions are drawn from premisses. As thinking, however, it is not the special province of logic, but part of the psychologist's subject matter. Psychologists who examine the reasoning process find it extremely complex and highly emotional, consisting of awkward trial and error procedures illuminated by sudden—and sometimes apparently irrelevant—flashes of insight. These factors are all of importance to psychology. But the logician is not interested in the actual process of reasoning. He is concerned with the correctness of the completed process. His question is always: does the conclusion *follow* from the premisses used or assumed?"[1]

[1] Irving M. Copi, *Symbolic Logic*, New York, 1954, p. 2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conception and Imagination

Secondly, we should recognise that a term such as "imagination" is going to be misunderstood since it is seldom used with any precision except by the psychologist and a handful of literary critics. It is, therefore, unfortunate that Maurice Cornforth should use the word "imagine" (as has already been remarked he seems capable of imagining the unimaginable) where his argument requires the word "conceive". The weak term (imagine) has been picked up and used by D.N.L. and by Emile Burns and has served only to fog the logical issue. Thus D.N.L. criticises Cornforth for maintaining that it is impossible to "make up even fairy tales about a world where the laws of logic did not apply". D.N.L. retorts with the contortion "not to be imaginable is not necessarily not to be true" ("To be unimaginable is not necessarily to be untrue"?) and refers cryptically to "the revolution in physics". Cornforth's argument actually stands or falls on the truth or falsity of the statement "A world in which the laws of logic do not apply is inconceivable". And whatever the "lesson" of the revolution in physics may be it is not that the behaviour of sub-atomic particles is inconceivable. Indeed, it is precisely thanks to that revolution that we now have some conception of their behaviour. It is, in any case, a basic tenet of Marxism that the truth *is* conceivable. Marxism and traditional logic are at one in affirming that truth is to be distinguished from incomprehensibility. It is not a question of whether man can at any particular moment of time actually conceive the truth, but of whether the truth is *in principle* conceivable; if x is in principle inconceivable, then x cannot be true.

Emile Burns has offered us a variation on the same theme. He agrees with Cornforth that the laws of logic "have to be discovered by us" and deduces that "many previous generations of human beings must have been able to 'imagine' things which did not accord with these laws". This is a subjectivist reply to Cornforth's contention that a world in which the laws of logic do not apply is unimaginable. But, that the laws of logic have not been formulated does not mean that they did not apply. It seems to be Emile Burns' position that the laws of logic could not apply prior to their formulation because since no-one knew them there was no-one to apply them. If this is his position it conflicts with the agreement between himself, Cornforth and D.N.L. that the laws of logic were *discovered* and not invented. In other words, everyone is agreed that the laws existed prior to their formulation; we did not simply make them up. And if they existed prior to formulation they must presumably have operated prior to being formulated. How then was it possible to imagine things contrary to those laws? If I imagine that p is logically equivalent to *not-p* I am not imagining something contrary to the laws of logic: I am simply being illogical. Whether or not I am aware of this is of no consequence. The discovery of the Laws of Logic did not make it impossible for people to be illogical any more than the discovery of the Laws of Grammar made it impossible for people to be ungrammatical. Oh that this were the case!

Ambiguous Objectivism

Thirdly: "objective" is one of the fundamental terms in the vocabulary of Marxism and it is therefore important that Marxists should have an understanding of its use and then attempt to use it with precision. Emile Burns, for instance, remarks that "the laws of logic . . . are drawn from objective reality". Now when one is discussing Laws of Nature and Laws of Logic this is at best an unenlightening remark and may well be confusing. The use of the term "objective" by many Marxists is ambiguous and does not indicate clearly the criteria appealed to: it can mean "independent of the existence of mankind", but it can also mean "independent of the existence of any individual or particular group of individuals". The Laws of Nature (but not, of course, the formulations of them) are objective in the first sense, that is to say they would exist whether mankind existed or not. Laws of Logic and Laws of Social Development are objective only in the second sense; these laws depend for their existence upon the existence of mankind although not upon the existence of you or me or of any other individual or collection of individuals *vis-à-vis* whom they are objective. The Laws of Logic, then, "are drawn from objective reality" only in the sense that they depend upon the outcome of certain kinds of human activity. It is in this sense that moral laws are objective. Harry Fomison seems to believe that because *mores* change they cannot be objective; a strange position for a Marxist.

Because the appeal to objective reality is part of the informal logic of Marxism it is essential that this appeal should not be confused with other kinds of appeal. Elsewhere in his article Emile Burns declares that "The test of any law is 'experience', objective reality". It is true that Marxists appeal to objective reality, but they only appeal to experience in so far as it *conforms to* objective reality. Experience and objective reality are not the same thing. Solipsists have long argued that they are. Certainly for the lunatic who imagines himself to be the Shah of Persia there may be no distinction between palace and asylum, but that is precisely why we call him a lunatic. Marxists have always rejected attempts to equate experience with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objective reality; objective reality is the test of experience.

Consciousness and Objectivity

D.N.L. also espouses the cause of solipsism in his objection to Cornforth's, "Assuming that a working definition of consciousness . . . ". He objects to this because, he claims, "the only consciousness of which I am directly aware is my own; and who is to say what it is, but myself?" D.N.L. presumes that we can only arrive at working definitions as a result of direct experience of the things defined. How, I wonder, does he square this with the "lesson of the revolution in physics" to which he alludes elsewhere in his article? Can we not arrive at a working definition of an alpha particle without having direct experience of one? How then did the revolution in physics come about? Consciousness, in any case, is a social term and not a private one.

The same writer, D.N.L., also insists that language is necessary to thought. That we think in language is questionable although it may well be true that many people introspect linguistically. If "thought" is taken to be synonymous with "introspection", then it is probably true that many (but not all) people think with the aid of concepts derived from language, but not with language.

Causality and Dialectics

The most interesting and helpful contribution to the present discussion is that made by Mike Steadman since it does raise the kind of question which, with more elucidation, may enable us to "place" the logical character of statements asserting dialectical laws. I suspect that his comments upon the relationship between the principle of causality and the laws of dialectics takes us to the heart of the matter, but I am not sure that his description of this relationship is sound. At one point in his article he affirms

> "that no matter which way one interprets the (yet unexplored) relationship between the principle of causality and the laws of dialectics, the truth of the latter is *dependent upon* the truth of the former." (My italics.—R.S.)

Later he writes that in the principle of causality we have

> "at least one falsifiable high-generalisation which is not only philosophically associated with, but actually *implied* by, the laws of dialectics."

Apparently, then, he is not at all sure of the relationship between the principle of causality and the laws of dialectics. To say that A is dependent upon B is not to say that A implies B. In the syllogism "All men are mortal; Socrates is a man; therefore Socrates is mortal", the truth of the conclusion is dependent upon the truth of the premisses, but "Socrates is mortal" does not imply that Socrates is a man or that all men are mortal. However, Steadman's final opinion is that the relationship between the principle of causality and the laws of dialectics is one of material implication (v. his appeal to *modus tollens*). This, it seems to me, is wrong.

The causal principle depends upon, but is not implied by, the many particular observations which find their expression in scientific laws. The laws themselves are causal not because they imply the principle of causality but because they affirm causal relationships. Similarly the dialectical law of the transformation of quantity into quality affirms a causal relationship: at a certain point a change of quantity causes a change of quality to take place. But this makes no presumptions about the principle of causality; it merely states that a particular kind of event (a change of quantity) becomes the cause of another particular kind of event (a change of quality). Although dialectical laws may affirm or imply such causal relationships they do not affirm or imply the principle of causality.

It seems to me that dialectics stands upon firmer ground than the principle of causality, for the idiom of causal relationships is dialectical as that of the causal principle is not: in the language of dialectics every event *is* a cause and every cause *is* an event; the question of whether an event *has* a cause does not arise. To the best of my knowledge none of the models constructed to reconcile electromagnetic and quantum theory has cast doubt upon this.

The point of stressing the connection between the laws of dialectics and causal relationships is to support the contention that the laws of dialectics are expressed in existential propositions; their truth depends upon experience—in principle they could be false, but as a matter of fact they are not.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Dialogue between Christianity and Marxism

(An Interim Comment)

John Lewis

I AM grateful to the Rev. Edward Charles for what he has said. Our differences do not touch the main issue. If I think the theological debate should not take priority it is not because philosophy is unimportant but because when the house is blazing I do not want to drag the fireman away from his hose to discuss the Laws of Thermodynamics. I think therefore that we need two separate but allied discussions; the main philosophical differences will go on being argued—I myself am continuously up to the neck in them—and they will chiefly concern those interested in theory. But there are many more people both clerical and lay who are not so interested in theology as they are in Vietnam, the seamen's strike and the Cold War. Edward Charles and I happen to be in both lots; but most people aren't.

The main point on the philosophical side seems to be this: I say that if thousands of Christians are now seeing the main impact and authority of religion in the challenge of social injustice and war, I am not going to argue with them as to whether this depends on certain theological assumptions. Marxists don't think so, but that isn't going to stop us joining forces with those that do; and I don't want the fact that we don't accept the theological justification of the moral or social protests to keep the religious people from working cordially and harmoniously with us. I don't think Edward Charles really disagrees here.

He himself has said much that is more in line with my article than with his criticism![1]

> "Christianity is primarily concerned with human relationships."
>
> "Christianity did not arise as an explanation of reality but as a fellowship of men and women ordering their lives in accordance with a dynamic conviction that a new world order was being established on earth."
>
> "It is only in the derivative realm of speculation that conflicts arise between men of science (read *Marxists*) and Christians." (This is my very point—J.L.)
>
> "Christians, like anyone else, are free to indulge in metaphysical speculation; but this, it should be recognised is not of the essence of Christianity."

There! the Rev. Edward Charles has said it all; what is it that we are disagreeing about? Well, I do differ about his estimation of the extent within the Church of ethical concern and full recognition of the sacred as being in these desperate issues of social justice, war and peace. He seems to think this far more generally recognised than I think it is. But here my reply is a simple one: I shan't mind a bit being shown I'm wrong by whole congregations turning out to march in the May Day Processions, or flocking to Trafalgar Square for demonstrations against the Vietnam War. I don't see them yet; but by golly I should like to.

Professor MacKinnon's deeply sympathetic letter warms my heart. I don't think the pietistic movement in Lutheran Christianity is really sensible of the social implications of Christianity. The followers of Barth and Brunner are much divided. Brunner was furious with Barth for opposing the Cold War. But when a man's beliefs drive him to take issue with evil in the modern world and to ally himself with the forces of righteousness I am his friend and ally, and I would rejoice even more if he could bring more and more of his followers over—but I don't see them. Dr. Josef Hromadka is well known to me, and I ought of course to have mentioned him. It is encouraging to find so many members of the Church in Czechoslovakia fully convinced, as so many are in Russia and other Socialist countries, that the work the Socialist State is trying to do is a realisation of Christian ideals. I am grateful for Professor MacKinnon's remarks on Adam Schaff's work; and especially his agreement with Schaff's criticism of the mere change of inward attitude, a mere act of choice which is not determined by a recognition of the objective situation that demands it.

I am anxious that the issues Professor MacKinnon and the Rev. Edward Charles raise shall however not be confined to a top level exchange of opinion. It is the rank and file who are as ready for it as we are. It must be organised there. But I have already met a strong reluctance in some Christian leaders to a confrontation with Marxists, because they, unlike my two Christian friends, seem alarmed at the prospect of being unable to maintain their own very distorted picture of Marxism, which would be impossible if they would speak *with* us and not just *about* us. That is why the removal of those misrepresentations which keep Christians and Marxists apart *is* a necessary phase of the dialogue.

[1] In his essay "Science and Christianity" (*Return to Reality*, edited by Canon S. Evans).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adam Fox

Canon Adam Fox: for twenty years a Canon of Westminster, before that a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; author of a life of Dean Inge (James Tait Black Memorial Book Prize for 1960); retired 1963. He reads Plato and Greek Tragedies for pleasure; his Plato for Pleasure *recently re-issued.*

I WAS much surprised when it was suggested to me that I might contribute to *Marxism Today*, because I am only a very old and a very old-fashioned clergyman, and I like to think myself orthodox. But I was much interested to read the articles on The Dialogue Between Christianity and Marxism in the March and May numbers, and perhaps I have something to say which might supplement them. For it appears to me that both John Lewis and Edward Charles have tried to discuss some common ground in a very useful way, but they have not really grappled with the fundamental difference between the two ideologies; Marxism, if I understand rightly, is only concerned with this world, while Christianity is and always has been an other-worldly religion. The attempts made by some of those who profess it to get rid of "heaven", as it is called, can only succeed in getting rid of Christianity, or so it seems to me. This other-worldliness needs to be reckoned with. "Escapism", you say. Yes certainly, in its own particular fashion, as expressed by the apostle Paul in the form "with Christ, which is far better",[1] but by no means confined to the Christians. Marcus Aurelius, a dogged Stoic, exclaims, "The poet says, Dear city of Cecrops; And mayst thou not say, Dear City of Zeus?" The great Plotinus was intent upon the "yonder": the consummation was to be "the flight of the alone to the Alone".

But let me use my own words: that is the only way to be lucid, if there is a way at all. My view of the world about us is in one sentence that it is not the real world, but a shadow or a projection or a pattern or a distorted mirage—call it what you will—of a real world of which it gives us intimations. But if it is only a shadow, it is a real shadow. That sounds something like Plato, you say. Yes, Platonism is just what it is, and a Platonism which is always floating about in men's minds, and not least in Christian minds. Whether Paul knew anything of Plato's writings is uncertain, but he is being almost precisely Platonist when he says "the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal. For we know that if the tent we inhabit on earth is taken down, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, and in heaven."[2] (To call the body "a tent" as here, was the philosophical language of the day.) To contrast the temporal and the eternal, the seen and the unseen, is just after Plato's mind; he would have said that the one is an intimation of the other, and Paul says the same in words which anyone who knew more of Plato than of Paul might very well attribute to Plato: "Since the creation of the world God's invisible attributes, namely his eternal power and divinity, have been visible, being apprehended in what he has made (lit. in his makings)."[3] Plato and Paul come to this characteristically Platonic view by different routes. It is what Christian Platonists stand by; the Christian Platonists of Alexandria stood by it in the 3rd century, and the group of Cambridge Platonists in the 17th century stood by it.

It is what I am standing by now. I think this world about me is full of wonders which I could never have suspected, and there are no doubt many more to come. I see order is one of its great qualities (the Greeks thought it was *the* great quality) and beauty is another, and variety and invention too; it is marvellously contrived; it looks like a work of art. I do not feel at all satisfied with supposing it just came like it is; that is not good enough; there must be a mind behind it all, a mind which I certainly cannot understand altogether; but I can understand it a little, and enough to think it implies a person, and for convenience, if for no other reason, I call this person God; and for the purposes of my own thinking I give him a body, and add other imagery to that, but of course it is inadequate imagery, because it can only be taken from this unreal world.

But why do I call it "this unreal world"? Because it has so many symptoms of unreality. It is as elusive as a ghost. I cannot stop it at some desirable moment; it will not keep still; I grasp at it, but I cannot hold it; it offers me images of pleasure and happiness, but they are apt to fade away, or if attained, not to be up to expectation. Desirables are often in short supply; and yet it is characteristic of man that he can have more than is good for him of almost everything, though this is far from saying that everyone can have enough; wine is a good example. This world seems all unfinished too. Some

[1] Philippians, 1.23.

[2] 2 Corinthians, 4.18-5.1.

[3] Romans, 1.20.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of it, to say the least, still needs a good deal of beautifying, and not everything has been reduced to order. We have tried to order it ourselves, and we have been very successful in many ways, though only in one big way. We have got some things under our control in quite a big way indeed, but this has only been where we can measure them. As Einstein once said, "I don't talk about reality, only what I can measure up". And even the measuring up is baffling; the lapse of time to the extent of millions of years, the distance from us of the heavenly bodies and their number, are baffling. If this world is an end in itself, it is plain silly, it does not make sense, and we humans with our aspirations and agonies are quite out of place in it, at best such stuff as dreams are made of.

But if this world and this life are intimations of another world, then they become significant. They give us clear intimation of infinity and eternity, but of much else. Plato called his other world a world of "ideas" or forms, but he never could quite say what was in it. One of the things he put in it was the idea of a table, and this it seemed somehow tended to take the form of a general proposition, as that "table is an object to put things on having a flat top and not less than three legs", and all the tables you ever saw were copies of this one which in fact probably didn't exist, in any accepted sense.[4] But a world of ideas would be rather arid, and in the end he stopped writing about it. The Christians are not altogether certain about their world either; they call it heaven, but allow that it is not in the sky: they are however sure that it is delightful and picture it as such: it consists of indestructibles; if these are material, they are not of this world's matter: they are indescribable except by images, but they are real. Sometimes they are reduced to Beauty, Truth, and Goodness, but this is a simplification. At least this world gives intimations, imperfect but often vivid, of perfection in the way of happiness and fellowship, a vision to see, perhaps a song to hear, satisfaction, peace, all of them only glimpsed at in this life. If all these are only dreams, then this life is doubly futile, as being the dream of a dream; it would not be a rational world at all. But our experience of the rational makes it certain that there must be a wholly rational (not only rational) world; and the corollary to this is that the world as we know it at present is not the real thing.

I imagine that Marxists will have nothing of all this. "It is just poetry", they will say. Well, it is poetry, but I won't allow it to be called "just poetry". So far poetry has moved the world a great deal more than statistics. It may be we are in for a new age for the matter of that, but I don't believe so myself.

What then is my attitude to life in this world as I see it? In a way I can say to myself that life does not matter very much. This is not to go along with Arthur Balfour who said, or is believed to have said, that nothing matters much and most things don't matter at all. That is not so. But a good deal of life is made up of trifles which we can deal with as they come along, not intent upon them, but not neglecting them either. They are like the air, they keep us alive. And at a level higher than triviality there are pleasures and improvements which claim serious attention; they make life tolerable, and more, they make it pleasant. But it is the great perfections that claim our utmost effort, not that these are attainable in this life, but we can grow fit for perfection when it comes; though, if we have made no effort or very little, we shall find perfection disquieting, daunting, even perhaps insipid. And if perfection is never to come, then effort is only a pastime.

To some it is given, though not to me, to think that the better ordering of human society is the thing most worth striving for. Strive for it we always shall, but it seems as if, by making this an end in itself, we shall end with no more than good intentions. Capitalism would work nicely, if everyone did his very best at the job he is paid for, but all too soon he begins to wonder whether he is paid enough. Communism has the very good idea of Fair Shares for all, but before long there must be bosses to say what are fair shares. Political economy is no substitute for personal responsibility, and a high sense of responsibility needs the sanction of some motive for self-sacrifice, and service to the community does not seem to be a sufficiently strong motive. For some at least Christianity provides it. Is this world by nature good enough for Marxism?

I have tried to say as a Christian what Marxism, unless I have been quite mistaken about it, is up against. "And what a lot of nonsense", I hear somebody saying, but this has been said before. About the year AD 55 what the Christians were preaching[5] seemed to the Jews an offence and to the Greeks sheer folly. But it won the day, and in spite of some irrelevant talk about "the space-age" this old world, or at least the men in it, look much the same as ever.

[4] *Republic* X. 596.

[5] Corinthians, 1.23.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Folk Music and Freedom of Art

Nigel Kelsey

BETTY REID in her contribution on The Freedom of Art (March, 1966), returns again to recent developments in the folk and pop music scene which she has dealt with elsewhere. It is a pity that this question in a Marxist journal should be put in such an "either—or" way.

The new popularity of certain forms of folk-singing and "protest" song, has been brought about as a result of the fruits of pioneering work in this country, and earlier in the United States, of artists who possessed artistic and political integrity. This, many of them have still retained despite all difficulties, and, despite the much greater success of those who arrived later, and without any disrespect to them, have done very well out of the developing interest in folk and folk-type song, which has followed the revival.

The temptations to follow popular and commercial trends in this kind of music have not just appeared. They were present in the past as well. Had some of the so-called "sectarians" given in to those temptations for whatever reason (opportunism or gain) the basis for the present "boom" would not have been in existence and many successful "folk" and folk-type artists would never have been heard of.

Welcome Developments

It is very easy to get enthusiastic at the success of songs which actually have lyrics with relevance to real life, real feelings and real issues and in some cases have some poetic or political value. When these lyrics deal with some of the social and political issues which have not been present in popular music for many years, and when they deal with issues of war and peace, racialism etc., it is understandable that some may get so carried away with their enthusiasm as to believe that a real cultural breakthrough has been made.

Obviously such developments are to be welcomed by all progressives and especially by Marxists even if the welcome is tempered by the knowledge that the so-called "boom" is at the mercy of the commercial interests who control the world of pop music, and that it is subject to the eternal turnover of musical fashion, crazes and the present day search for "new sounds" and gimmicks.

It is obvious that the present vogue of topical songs owes much to the inspiration of folk music and of the new songs written in the last few years in the folk idiom. Many of these topical songs are however much nearer to ordinary pop song, revue song etc. and perhaps resemble most the type of topical cabaret song popular on the Continent. There is nothing wrong in this of course, and such songs are infinitely to be preferred to the inanities of the vast majority of pop song material.

Criticism Necessary

To condemn these songs because they are not something else would be purist, sectarian and foolish. At the same time it is necessary to point out to the unwary that much of this material which is labelled "folk-song" is spurious and one is correct to criticise it for claiming to be what it is not. If this is not done there is a great danger that the source of the folk song revival would become obscured and in the end the folk revival movement would peter out, apart from a few devotees, or that it would turn into something very different.

To perceive these dangers is not to be sectarian. It would be right to take anyone to task if he or she claimed that "there but for fortune" is music in the folk idiom. It would however be wrong to attack it because it is something else. It has a particular kind of sentimental melody which appeals to many and its ideas could be subscribed to by almost any religious group and has been the theme of countless Sunday sermons. This does not mean that it is necessarily a bad song. It might make many people think. Very few pop songs ever do this.

It seems to me that the most healthy developments in popular music and certainly in the songs of the Labour and progressive movements, have been those which owed their inspiration to folk music. The same may very well be true for art music as well. This inspiration is worth preserving unspoilt.

Some of the "protest" material is musically bad and some lyrics are atrocious. To throw standards of criticism overboard just because these songs are progressive and reach the charts, would be dishonest and opportunist.

There is no reason why such criticism should be unfriendly, but where necessary, it should be made.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Commercial Process

There is no doubt that many fine songs have been cheapened and emasculated in the commercial process. When Pete Seeger and others sang the "Hammer Song" it was a noble song and few who heard it could doubt its meaning. When Lopez sang it, it had little meaning and certainly no nobility. Many who heard the pop version of "What Have They Done To The Rain?", which reached the charts, could have had no real conception of what the song was really about.

Bob Dylan's best songs were almost all written before he became the tremendous success which he has now attained, such songs as "Masters of War", "Hard Rain", etc. His more recent material does not deal so forthrightly with the great issues. If he sings in a more muted vein, he at least sells more records.

After all the hard work that has been done in the folk field rescuing our heritage before it disappeared and giving it a new lease of life, after all the fine new songs in the folk idiom which the revival has produced, to hail uncritically the new developments in the charts and to jump on the commercial bandwagon of pop-art, pop-folk and so called "protest" would be an act of folly and would be a betrayal of those who have worked in the folk revival movement without attaining financial success, or without seeking it, in many cases.

There is a useful field for all kinds of experiment in the folk field and its offshoots, for singers, musicians, writers, composers etc. At the same time there is a wide field where co-existence between folk, near folk and the best of pop music can take place, but all should be good of their kind and be sincere. I agree that commercial success is no crime, but it behoves us to remember that such success has meant the downfall of the artistic integrity of many in the musical world in the past.

Marxists must appraise the positive features of all the new developments and must at the same time point out the weaknesses and the pitfalls. They must establish a critical point of view but at the same time avoid antagonising those who can be allies. The questions at stake are not simply political or simply cultural. It would be wrong to overlook the one while maintaining a position on the other. It seems to me that Betty Reid's standpoint is not very helpful in this respect.

Traditional Folk Song

G. Freeman

IS folk song to be regarded as a living art form, a means of human expression and communication, through the medium of arrangements of vocal sound symbols; or is it primarily the concern of the antiquarian, who collects songs of a past age, much in the manner that others collect the rubbings of ancient church brasses?

Ian Campbell, the "traditional" folk singer, has been reported by the *Melody Maker* as saying that a certain contemporary singer could not be classified as a "folk" singer because he did not sing Irish songs in the style that one hears them sung in Ireland, and Ewan MacColl, in an interview with Karl Dallas, printed in the same journal, has expressed similar opinions.

But it is a fact that the vast majority of those who hear folk songs do not, and have not, lived in remote Irish village communities. A contemporary folk singer has to try and reach out to a far greater audience than that to be found in some isolated farming or fishing community, and his style of singing has to evolve to contain the new content of his song and to convey that content in the most effective manner.

The contemporary folk singer has to decide whether he wishes to be a creative artist, serving "present day" society through his art form, or whether he intends to be an antiquarian, a collector and cataloguer of the songs of past societies.

The antiquarian has a very important function in the Folk Song Movement. In my own field as a sculptor, I fully appreciate the importance of museums of art and the cataloguing of the art styles of past human societies, but as a Socialist artist, I am deeply conscious of the artist's duty in helping to build a future society. One cannot expect the masses of a contemporary, highly industrialised society to have any great appreciation of past styles of singing. One has to be a dedicated "folk" scholar indeed, to endure the monotonous "wailing" of many "traditional" folk singers, who use a style of singing which has little relationship to contemporary society. The fact that a particular song can be traced back some hundreds of years does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessarily mean that it possesses any great merit and the majority of songs that are classed as "traditional" lack both social and artistic significance. It is a pity that "politically educated" folk singers should waste their talents on collecting and singing ballads, whose content is generally on the level of a "young woman's lament that her true love was drowned in the millstream on his way home from the 'local'," and which are sung in a manner that would make a robust contemporary working class audience "hoot" with derision.

It is interesting to note that certain "Pop" songwriters have begun to explore the song styles of other human societies, including those of Asia. Although this exploration does not, as yet, derive from a serious intellectual and aesthetic basis, it is nevertheless akin to the interest shown by contemporary visual artists and also dramatists, such as Brecht, in the art styles of other societies and in adapting elements of these styles in their own work, in a conscious attempt to evolve an art form to fit the increasingly broad humanist content, with which as artists they are concerned. The search by songwriters, for significant sounds (of which Ewan MacColl complains), is certainly close in approach to the visual abstract artist's search for significant shapes. But it is a search which lacks the basis of aesthetic and intellectual consciousness and training.

When the present position of "traditional" folk singers is related to the visual arts, one is forced to admit that a sculptor, who confined his creative output almost entirely to producing copies of the carvings existing in the Saxon and Norman churches in this country, would not be making any significant contribution, either to the development of his art form or in serving contemporary society as an artist. But this is the position which the majority of "traditional" folk singers would seem content to occupy in the British Folk Song Movement.

Musicians, visual artists and dramatists of all countries have a vital contribution to make in the strengthening of the revolutionary solidarity of peoples, through the exploration of each others' art forms and the continuous evolving of their art styles to fit the content of the international human condition.

When artists examine and analyse their own and others' cultural heritage, they should not do so in order that they may become antiquarians (although antiquarians have made and will continue to make an important contribution in the task of building a better society), but so that they may evolve their art forms to fit the content of the international revolutionary struggle and assist the building of a new socialist society.

The international visual art section are making a remarkable contribution towards the evolving of an international visual language, that exists independently of the far too numerous, spoken and written languages of the world. It is the responsibility of the musicians and song writers to thoroughly explore their international musical heritage and to evolve new musical styles that will convey the tremendous message of human revolutionary solidarity in the clearest and most effective manner.

As mankind becomes increasingly conscious of its own fundamental unity, the various art forms, which are its means of expression and communication, will continuously evolve to reflect this unity.

OPEN DISCUSSION CONFERENCE

on

"Attacking Britain's Economic Problems"

Brache Centre, Osborne Road, Luton
October 15th and 16th, 1966
(arrive Friday evening October 14th)
All-in-cost: 35s.

Papers will be presented for discussion,

on "THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S NATIONAL ECONOMIC PLAN", by J. R. Campbell

on "GROWTH, INVESTMENT AND INFLATION", by William MacCullum

on "THE STERLING AREA, THE CITY AND CAPITAL EXPORTS", by Tom Drinkwater

Apply to: Education Department, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2.

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Old Russian Paintings and Ikons

Recent discoveries of old Russian paintings are illustrated in a new book:

OLD RUSSIAN PAINTING

Containing 48 full-page, excellent colour reproductions, each with one page description and commentary in English and Russian by art historians.
Small reproductions at the end give catalogue details of each painting.

12″ × 9″; cloth Ref. 2182 **42s**

For those interested in the study of this form of art, Collet's offer the following Film Strips:

THE PAINTER ANDREW RUBLEV
45 frames. Black and white Ref. 0649 **12s 6d**

THE PALEKH MINIATURE
54 frames. Colour Ref. 1771 **25s 0d**

ARCHITECTURE OF THE KREMLIN
59 frames. Black and white Ref. 0104 **12s 6d**

ZAGORSK—A Historical Monument
61 frames. Colour Ref. 0109 **25s 0d**

HISTORICAL MONUMENTS OF THE MOSCOW KREMLIN
in 3 parts totalling 162 frames. Colour
Forthcoming at **75s**

Please add 10% for postage

Collet's **Russian Bookshop**

39 Museum Street, London, W.C.1

July 1966 is the thirtieth anniversary of the outbreak of the Spanish War

---

SPAIN 1936-1939

José Sandoval and Manuel Azcárate

7s. 6d.

"We strongly recommend this book to all who want to recall the true history of that great popular struggle, which has since been so greatly and so often distorted by writers who sacrifice objectivity to the demands of cold war propaganda"

Marxism Today
Editorial Notes, June 1966

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just published

LENIN:
A BIOGRAPHY

Editor: P. N. Pospelov

This new full length biography has been prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It sets out to record, besides purely biographical details, the most important guiding ideas which form Lenin's ideological legacy. It draws, more extensively than in previous editions, on the rich literature of personal memoirs of the period, and is illustrated with 46 plates.

588 pp. *illustrated* **17s 6d**

Also the complete range of all works by Lenin in English translation.

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

1966 — No. 6

H. FARIA
After the Government Crisis in Venezuela

J. DUCLOS
Communist Municipalities and their Work

IB. NORLUND
Notes from Hanoi

Price 2s. 6d. (plus 6d. postage)
15s. for 6 months
30s. for 1 year

from

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.,
37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1

HOLIDAY SCHOOL

on
Marxism, Philosophy and Culture

Grassington in the Yorkshire Dales

July 30th - August 6th

Cost: £11 per head
(It is regretted that children cannot be accepted)

For further information apply to:
Education Department, Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED